JUNE 1974

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

PAUL M. SWEEZY and HARRY MAGDOFF
VOLUME 26

ALONSO AGUILAR
SAMIR AMIN
JAMES and GRACE BOGGS
HARRY BRAVERMAN

2

MARXISM: LOOKING BACKWARD AND FORWARD

PARESH CHATTOPADHYAY
OLIVER COX
ISABEL LARGUIA and JOHN DUMOULIN
RALPH MILIBAND
ANDREAS PAPANDREOU
CLIVE THOMAS

Special 25th anniversary issue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME 26 NUMBER 2 JUNE 1974

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Twenty-Five Eventful Years
by the Editors 1

MARXISM: LOOKING BACKWARD AND FORWARD
Introduction 14
Alonso Aguilar 15
Samir Amin 19
James and Grace Lee Boggs 28
Harry Braverman 40
Paresh Chattopadhyay 49
Oliver C. Cox 53
Isabel Larguía and John Dumoulin 59
Ralph Miliband 64
Andreas G. Papandreou 67
Clive Y. Thomas 72

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August, when bimonthly, and copyright © 1974, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 62 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011.
Telephone: (212) 691-2555.
Europe: R. Handyside, 21 Theobalds Road, London WCIX 8SL.
Telephone: 01-242-3501.
MR Edizione Italiana: viale Orazio Flacco 15, Bari 70124.
Telephone: 241919, 246157.
MR in Spanish: Apdo. Nal. 8004, Bogota, Colombia.

Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 118 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$9 in the U.S.; $10 foreign. (Institutions and libraries—U.S. $12; foreign $13.)
By 1st Class mail—U.S. $14; elsewhere $16.
By air mail—No. America $16; So. America and Europe $20.
By air mail—Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $22.

EDITORS: Paul M. Sweezy Harry Magdoff Leo Huberman (1903-1968)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Bobbye Ortiz

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Our next issue, the annual special July-August number, will consist entirely of parts of Harry Braverman's book *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, which is on MR Press's fall publication list. The summer issue will include somewhat less than one third of the total manuscript. We are convinced that this will be one of the Press's most important publications and will mark a milestone in the development of U.S. Marxism.

(*Continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWENTY-FIVE EVENTFUL YEARS

"In reality," Lenin wrote early in 1920, "all the old forms of the socialist movement have acquired a new content, and, consequently, a new sign, the 'minus' sign, has appeared in front of all the figures; but our wiseacres stubbornly continued (and still continue) to persuade themselves and others that 'minus three' is more than 'minus two'!"* Not surprisingly, something similar happened after the Second World War. The old forms acquired a new content, and in some cases the new content required new forms to accommodate it. But the wiseacres were too blind or too doctrinaire or too stupid to see it.

Looking back over the 25 years of MONTHLY REVIEW's existence (Volume 1 appeared in in May 1949), we are struck by how long we conformed to the wiseacre pattern. It would be tiresome to engage in a textual examination and critique of MR's early views and how they later changed, some gradually and some quite abruptly. But it may be useful, not least for purposes of self-clarification, to point out some of the major changes which have occurred in this period, both in the realm of historical facts and in the manner of perceiving and interpreting these facts.

What may perhaps be called the Marxist conventional wis-

* *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder,* Selected Works in Two Volumes (Moscow, 1951), vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 432.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom saw the world as it emerged from the Second World War as being divided into three clearly distinguishable parts: (1) a handful of advanced capitalist countries; (2) a large number of precapitalist (mostly feudal) colonies, semi-colonies, and dependencies of the advanced (imperialist) powers; and (3) a bloc of socialist countries, headed by the USSR, including the countries of Eastern Europe, and soon to be joined by China and the liberated areas of Vietnam and Korea. The historical period then opening would be characterized by certain broad and irreversible tendencies. The capitalist countries would be plagued by recurring and increasingly severe crises and depressions, resulting in a radicalization of their working classes. The precapitalist countries would be the scene of bourgeois revolutions, backed and in some cases perhaps even led by the working classes; thereafter they would follow the same road as the already capitalist countries. The socialist countries, liberated from the contradictions of capitalism, would increase their productivity, their production, and hence their living standards by leaps and bounds, catching up with and then surpassing even the most advanced of the capitalist countries. With capitalism foundering and socialism flourishing, the workers of the world would become increasingly conscious of where their true interests lie, with a resultant steady increase in the size and strength of socialist movements everywhere. Successful socialist revolutions would become more frequent, thus expanding the socialist bloc. Since the countries making up the socialist bloc already had eliminated classes, or were on the way to doing so, they would be free of conflicting national interests and ambitions and would have every incentive to join together in ever closer economic cooperation and eventual political union. The end of this historical period would thus be marked by the formation of a world socialist state. After that would come the period of the transition from socialism to communism on a world scale.

This is of course not the way things have been going these past 25 years. In the advanced capitalist countries economic downswings have been relatively mild; radicalization in the working class has occurred mostly among younger workers who in strictly economic terms have fared considerably better than their parents; social democratic parties have for the most part stopped even pretending to be for socialism; and Communist parties

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were founded with revolutionary goals have become openly reformist. In what came to be known during this period as the Third World, there were no bourgeois revolutions and no countries following the development pattern of the advanced capitalist countries (Japan was the last country to do that); formal independence generally turned out to be sham independence. As far as the socialist bloc is concerned, Cuba has been the only additional socialist country since North Vietnam, China, and North Korea; the bloc as a whole, far from uniting economically or politically, has fallen apart, with its two largest members, the USSR and China, in a state of open hostility. Finally, the notion of an economic race, in terms of production and living standards, between the capitalist and socialist worlds has borne little relation to reality: very uneven development, both within and between countries, has characterized both sides, and whatever averages might be concocted would have no significance for anyone.

It seems obvious that there was something radically wrong with the Marxist conventional wisdom of 25 years ago, and yet this is by no means the conclusion that all self-proclaimed Marxists have drawn from the experiences of this period. In fact, on all essentials the Soviet CP and its sympathizers in other countries continue to hold practically the same views as they did in 1949 (and even earlier for that matter). The workers in the advanced capitalist countries are assumed to be not only potentially but actually a revolutionary force. The reformism of their political parties does not contradict this, since under the doctrines of peaceful coexistence and peaceful transition to socialism (propounded in the Khrushchev era) it is possible to be both reformist and revolutionary at the same time. The absence of bourgeois revolutions and "normal" capitalist development in the Third World is ignored or denied: decolonization is sometimes treated as though it were a genuine revolution, and the Soviet-oriented ideologists are as ready as their U.S.-oriented counterparts to bestow upon the countries of the Third World the honorific title of "developing." If the accessions to the socialist bloc have been so few, and indeed during the last 15 years nonexistent, this only means that the pace of history has been slower than some had anticipated in the flush of victory at the end of the Second World War. As far as the socialist bloc

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is concerned, it has not really fallen apart. What has happened instead is that the Chinese, under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, have temporarily defected from it. But this is not likely to last: after Mao is gone, the Chinese will return to the fold and the socialist bloc, once again under the wise and firm leadership of the Soviet Union, or rather of the Soviet Communist Party, will move forward stronger and more united than ever. In the meantime, the Soviet Union and its loyal allies are gaining ground both absolutely and relatively, and have already reached what Dean Acheson used to call a position of strength in which they can afford "détente" with the advanced capitalist countries, taking advantage of the more relaxed atmosphere to strike bargains in the trade and investment field which will help the socialist camp to ultimate victory.

Not all Marxists of course could buy this line. In fact to many, ourselves included, this kind of "explanation" of the palpable discrepancy between theory and reality seemed more and more to take on the characteristics of pure ideology in the worst sense of the term. It became increasingly clear that what was needed was not a Panglossian description of reality to fit the theory but a re-thinking of the theory to conform to, explain, and provide a guide to action designed to change the reality. And it was this need which gave rise to a veritable renaissance of Marxism.

This renaissance had many sources, some obvious, some not so obvious, and some probably as yet unknown or unrecognized. At the top of the list must be placed the Chinese Revolution, though it was not until approximately a decade after the seizure of power that its full significance began to be widely appreciated. The reason for this lag was in large part that the Chinese themselves were much influenced by Soviet ideas and practices and for a long time actually copied important aspects of the Soviet "model." In addition, the military protection and economic aid provided by the Soviet Union in the early years of the People's Republic were highly valued. The Chinese were therefore at pains not to emphasize or even admit the existence of differences between themselves and the Russians, and it was not until the open break that followed the withdrawal of the Soviet technicians in 1960 that most Marxists learned the real situation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless, it is clear, at least in retrospect, that in crucial respects Maoist policies in both the economic and political fields were fundamentally different from those practiced in the Soviet Union since at least the late 1920s. In particular, Mao never entertained the idea of a necessary period of "primitive socialist accumulation" at the expense of the peasantry, which was shared by *all* the Soviet factions after Lenin's death (differences among them relating to pace and methods rather than substance), and which led in the USSR to the fatal break between the urban workers and the rural peasants. In China, on the contrary, the worker-peasant alliance was strictly maintained, and the Chinese economy was able at all times to advance "walking on two legs." Under these conditions there was neither need nor temptation to practice repression against large masses of people: the only ones who had to be repressed were the counter-revolutionaries who constituted but a small proportion of the Chinese people.

After the Sino-Soviet split became a matter of public knowledge and debate, the whole scene changed. It was as though a dam had suddenly burst. Much that was time-honored and taken for granted was swept away; everything, and not only the issues specifically in dispute between the Chinese and the Russians, came under questioning and review. The renaissance of Marxism had begun in earnest.

Meanwhile, other currents of renewal had begun to flow. With few exceptions the influential Marxist theorists of the period through the Second World War were Europeans, or at least European-trained. Not entirely inconsistently with Marx, but also by no means with unambiguous backing of his authority, they saw the history of the rest of the world repeating that of Europe. Once capitalism was implanted in feudal or other pre-capitalist formations, it would inevitably expand in accordance with its inner nature, spawn a native bourgeoisie and proletariat, and initiate the successive dramas of bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. This view carried with it certain strategic and tactical imperatives which became part of the conventional Marxist wisdom in the colonial and dependent countries (the Third International played an important role in this process of indoctrination). The trouble was that things didn't work out that way. Here again China was a key. The Kuomintang-Commu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nist alliance which was supposed to produce national liberation and a period of capitalist development led only to the disastrous defeat of 1927 and further subjection of China to the rule of foreign capital. The other side of the coin, however, was the Communist withdrawal to the countryside, the rise to leadership of Mao, and the hammering out of a new course with the peasantry as the base, the proletariat as the leading factor, and assorted bourgeois factions in altogether subordinate roles. The fact that this course led, by a long and tortuous route, to the victory of 1949 was in itself a standing challenge to the old ideas. But it was not only in China that the traditional view failed to provide reliable political guidance. In case after case, beginning with India, national bourgeoisies refused to recognize their supposed revolutionary responsibilities and instead became in effect local allies and agents of imperialist rule. In response to this situation, Marxists, especially in the Third World itself, began to see the absolute necessity of re-thinking the entire problem of world capitalist history, the place in it of the colonies and dependencies, and the requirements of a successful strategy of liberation. Out of this came a burst of creative writing around the double dialectic of center/periphery and development/underdevelopment, leading inexorably to the conclusion that the day of the bourgeois revolution is past and that in the second half of the twentieth century only a proletarian-peasant revolution can bring genuine liberation to the peoples of the Third World —a conclusion supported positively by the experience of Cuba and negatively by a sadly long list of failed revolutions in the last two decades. (We at MR are proud that one of the earliest and most influential contributions to this literature was the late Paul Baran's *Political Economy of Growth*, published by MR Press in 1957. We hasten to add, however, that like other landmark works in the social sciences Baran's would have remained in relative obscurity, as it indeed has in the United States, but for the fact that the younger generation of Marxists in the Third World were already beginning to think along similar lines and were prepared to receive its message and to move rapidly beyond it with a wealth of theoretical and empirical studies.)

Another aspect of the renaissance of Marxism relates to what may be called the political economy of advanced capital-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism. Not only have the crises and depressions of the last 25 years been relatively mild by older standards, but also various other major changes in the structure and functioning of capitalism have occurred: dominance of the economy by a handful of giant corporations operating in many industries and many countries (conglomerates and multinationals), an enormously increased role for the state as a provider of services and at least partial regulator of economic activity, increasingly aggressive and exploitative imperialism by those countries with the power to implement such policies, the squandering of human and natural resources not only on military preparations and adventures but also on increasingly irrational and wasteful forms of salesmanship and consumption, all leading to a more and more alienated and dehumanized culture, which in many respects seems to be in irreconcilable conflict with a sane and healthy human existence. None of these developments appeared overnight, of course, and Marxists have long been in the forefront of those observing and commenting on them. Nevertheless, while it was always obvious that these trends in late capitalism were connected to the growth of monopoly, Marxist economics generally treated them empirically rather than theoretically, failing to connect them in a dialectically organic way with the underlying process of capital accumulation seen as the driving force of the whole system and the generator of its proliferating contradictions. Starting as far back as Josef Steindl's *Maturity and Stagnation in American Capitalism* (1952), some Marxist economists began work on this range of problems. But it cannot be said that the resultant literature has been particularly impressive, either quantitatively or qualitatively; and one glaring omission up to now is the absence of any serious studies of the effects of technology and corporate organization in the monopoly phase of capitalism on the labor process and the working class, subjects which of course occupied the very center of attention in Marx's own work. Why this should be so is not an easy question to answer, but the hypothesis may be suggested that the relative backwardness of the Marxian analysis of monopoly capitalism (except in its international manifestations, in respect to which Lenin already took decisive steps forward long ago) is, at least in part, the reflection of the absence up to the present of any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serious revolutionary movement and activity in the advanced capitalist countries. Marxism leads us to expect an intimate relation between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice: where either is missing the other will be at the very least severely handicapped.

We have spoken of a renaissance of Marxism, and the term seems to us exact. It might also have been appropriately used to describe what happened under the influence of Lenin and the Bolsheviks during the First World War and at the time of the October Revolution. The various forms of "revisionism" which flourished in the period of the Second International produced what was really more a negation than a revision of Marxism. The only way to combat it was to bring genuine Marxism back to life again, and this is what Lenin did both in practice and in theory (most notably in *State and Revolution* in which absolutely central teachings of Marx were rescued from incredible distortions). In this latest renaissance, unfortunately, the very same rescue operation had to be performed all over again, and this time it was accomplished through the powerful polemic directed by the Chinese at the Moscow-oriented Communist movement in the early 1960s (the most detailed statement of the Chinese case against the new revisionism was "More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us: Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World," *Hongqi*, March 4, 1963, published separately as a book by the Foreign Languages Press in Peking). But this time the renaissance of Marxism went much deeper. With theory and practice advancing in tandem, especially during the years of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the Chinese developed a critique of the USSR, its historical course, and its contemporary policies which went far beyond anything expressed or even hinted at in the polemics of a few years earlier. The chief internal enemies, the main targets of the Cultural Revolution, were identified as the capitalist roaders, and the capitalist road was the road the Russians had already traveled. From this logically followed not only the domestic policies of the Cultural Revolution but also the castigation of the USSR as a social imperialist superpower and the most dangerous enemy of China and the Chinese Revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is important to understand the sense in which this constituted a deepening of the renaissance of Marxism. In repudiating the Soviet model, the Chinese had necessarily to strike out in other directions. The term which most effectively summarizes this course, partly new and partly a shifting of emphases, is "putting politics in command" as contrasted to the capitalist *and* Soviet practice of putting economics in command. This is not the place to spell out the meaning of putting politics in command: suffice it to say that its central core is egalitarianism in the widest and deepest sense of the term, i.e., the reduction and ultimate elimination not only of differences in income, but also of differences in knowledge, power, privilege, and everything else that divides people and sets them against each other, either as groups or as individuals, and thus makes it impossible for them to live together in solidarity and happiness.* But it is clear that this is also precisely the core of Marx's thinking about socialism and communism. He never conceived of these new and higher forms of society as merely more productive of economic goods and services: in his view they would be above all more human, more just, more productive of a good life for all the people. The Chinese were thus reviving and putting into practice ideas of Marx which had long since been discarded and even denigrated as petty bourgeois sentimentalism in the Soviet Union. For Lenin, putting economics in command, as in the New Economic Policy introduced in 1921, was an unfortunate necessity, a regrettable retreat from Marxian principles, to be reversed as soon as possible. For Stalin, on the other hand, the very idea of equality was anathema: at the 17th Congress of the CPUSSR in 1934, he denounced the equalization of wages and salaries as "a reactionary, petty bourgeois absurdity worthy of a primitive sect of ascetics but not of a socialist society organized on Marxian lines.** At no time later did either Stalin or his successors change their tune: for them, putting economics in command was of the very essence of Marxism. And this is why

* Perhaps the clearest exposition of what this means in economic terms is John Gurley's well-known article "Capitalist and Maoist Economic Development," an abridged version of which appeared in MONTHLY REVIEW, February 1971, pp. 15-35.

** Quoted in Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin: A Political Biography*, p. 338n.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we say that the Chinese deepened the renaissance of Marxism in the new course which they adopted during and after the Cultural Revolution.

But this is not to imply that the Chinese never made any mistakes of their own. In particular, it seems to us that their analysis of what actually happened in the USSR and what kind of society now exists in the Soviet bloc leaves much to be desired. Their story is that the October Revolution was a socialist revolution which brought to power a dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the leadership of Lenin and after him of Stalin, the country moved in the direction of socialism. After Stalin's death, however, capitalist roaders wormed their way into the leadership of the party and the government, reversed course, and restored capitalism. Precisely the same threat was (and still is) present in China. First, it was Liu Shao-chi and his followers, then Lin Piao, and doubtless there will be others in the future. The real weakness of this theory (and other theories of a similar nature) is not so much that it is wrong as that it doesn't explain anything. Where did the capitalist roaders come from? Whom do they represent other than themselves? What gives them the power to subvert an apparently well-established dictatorship of the proletariat? Once we ask questions like these, we leave the realm of bad guys and their plots and conspiracies and enter that of serious historical analysis.

Now we do not doubt that Mao and others in the Chinese leadership are perfectly capable of analyzing the history of the Soviet experience from a consistently Marxist point of view, or even that the essence of such an analysis could be constructed from a sufficiently careful and detailed examination of their statements and actions stretching over the whole period of their association with the USSR and its leaders. But for political reasons which we could do no more than guess at, they have never explicitly made such an analysis, and what they have put out on the subject is not very helpful to those who might want to make the effort themselves.

Of course there are theories of Soviet history and Soviet society other than the official Soviet and Chinese versions, quite a few by Marxists. Perhaps the oldest and best known is the Trotskyist theory according to which the Soviet Union is still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a workers' state (to the Trotskyists this follows from the absence of private ownership of the means of production) but it is not, and has not been since Stalin took over, under the direct rule of the proletariat. Rather it is a *degenerated* workers' state, ruled by a bureaucracy. There are a number of "state capitalist" theories, the most carefully thought-out of which holds that because of the backwardness of Tsarist Russia the Bolshevik Revolution was unavoidably a bourgeois revolution, and the CPUSSR, regardless of its intentions, has necessarily presided over a capitalist state from the beginning. Finally, there is a theory, also existing in a number of versions, which is close to the official Soviet and Trotskyist theories on the early phase of Soviet development (up until Lenin's death), but which diverges from both of these theories (and from the official Chinese theory as well) on the nature of the Stalinist period. According to this view, the bureaucratic-technocratic stratum (much of it a legacy of the old order) which ruled the country in the name of the Communist Party gradually hardened into a true ruling *class* (to which Charles Bettelheim has given the name "state bourgeoisie") which exploits the workers and disposes over their surplus product in its class interest rather than in theirs. Hence the maintenance of the hierarchical division of labor and the methods of organization and management developed during centuries of capitalist rule, the depoliticization of the masses, the necessity of repression, and other well-known features of Soviet society which are inconsistent with its being considered in any sense a socialist or workers' state. The Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe are thus examples of what Samir Amin has called "capitalism without capitalists," an historically novel social formation which has yet to be subjected to thoroughgoing scientific scrutiny.

As readers of MONTHLY REVIEW know, we lean to this last view. But we do not consider the question finally settled. And even if the "capitalism without capitalists" theory should prove to be basically correct, there is still a long way to go from there to the elucidation of this society's "laws of motion." These are not academic questions—i.e., questions to which it makes no difference what the answers may be—but rather questions which are absolutely fundamental to an understanding of the present

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

historical epoch. Without good answers to them, much of our reasoning and speculation about what goes on in the world is bound to be little more than groping in the dark. It follows that Marxists everywhere have an inescapable responsibility to pay serious attention to these questions, to study and debate them in a scientific spirit, and to make whatever contribution they can to the reaching of valid answers.

A word in conclusion, as we enter our second quarter century of publication. MR started out as an independent socialist journal, with equal stress on the two adjectives. Conscious of the enormous amount of educational work that needed to be done to further the cause of socialism, MR's founders were equally convinced that under the conditions then prevailing in the United States maintaining independence of any political party or tendency was important for the advance of Marxist analysis. Looking back, we are more convinced than ever that this was a correct decision. The experience of MR has shown, we trust, that it is possible to be consistently loyal to the cause of socialism and to engage nonetheless in active critical analysis, uninhibited by the demands of any rigid orthodoxy. But it is important to recognize that this independence has its penalties as well, insofar as it induces an aloofness from the processes of political mobilization and action.

Perhaps more important than errors of analysis committed by MR in the past has been the magazine's lack of contribution to the emergence of an organization that would effectively bring together the diverse energies of the revolts and movements which sprouted in the 1960s. Not that we see our role as being the instigators or sponsors of such an organization. But along with other socialists and anti-imperialists we are desperately aware of the need for it, and that progress in revolutionary theory will be hobbled unless interrelated with revolutionary practice. We do not know how to proceed in this direction, especially in the light of the multiplicity of sects on the Left and the resistance to the assumption of organizational responsibility by the presumably large number of unorganized socialists. On these matters as well as our analysis of affairs in the United States and the world scene we are painfully aware of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the deficiencies of our past efforts and we know that a better performance is required of us and our collaborators in the future. In this sense we hope that all of you, subscribers and readers, will consider yourselves as collaborators. Let us have your criticisms, your comments, your suggestions. A political publication, above all a socialist publication, must involve the cooperation and interaction of editors, writers, and readers if it is to serve a useful purpose.

(May 10, 1974)

Citizens, let us think of the fundamental principle of the International, solidarity! It is by establishing this vivifying principle on a strong basis, among all the working people of all countries, that we shall achieve the great goal we have set ourselves. The revolution needs solidarity, and we have a great example of it in the Paris Commune, which fell because a great revolutionary movement corresponding to that supreme rising of the Paris proletariat did not arise in all centres, in Berlin, Madrid and elsewhere.

Karl Marx, The Hague Congress,
Amsterdam, September 8, 1872

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a way of observing the 25th anniversary of the publication of the first issue of MONTHLY REVIEW, we invited a number of MR authors—of articles or books, some of which have not yet been published—to write a short essay on (1) advances in Marxism during this 25-year period, and (2) areas or subjects which are especially in need of further work in the period ahead.

In what follows we present the responses of those who were able to accept our invitation. That there are not more is owing largely to the fact that we were late in issuing the invitation. We identify the contributors in alphabetical order, along with the title, in each case, of one MR work.

ALONSO AGUILAR, of the National University of Mexico, author of *Pan-Americanism from Monroe to the Present: A View from the Other Side.*

SAMIR AMIN, head of the UN-sponsored African Institute of Economic Development and Planning (Dakar), author of *Accumulation on a World Scale,* to be published this summer.

JAMES and GRACE LEE BOGGS, authors of *Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century,* published recently.

HARRY BRAVERMAN, director of Monthly Review Press, author of *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century,* to be published in the fall.

PARESH CHATTOPADHYAY, author of "On the Political Economy of the Transition Period," MONTHLY REVIEW, September 1972.

OLIVER C. COX, Emeritus Professor of Sociology at Wayne State University, author of *Caste, Class, and Race.*

ISABEL LARGUIA and JOHN DUMOULIN, authors of a forthcoming and still untitled work on the economic role of women in capitalist society.

RALPH MILIBAND, Professor of Political Science at Leeds University, England, author of "The State and Revolution," MONTHLY REVIEW, April 1970.

ANDREAS PAPANDREOU, member of the Greek government overthrown by the colonels' coup of 1967, now Professor of Economics at York University in Toronto, leader of PAK (Pan-Hellenic Liberation Movement), author of "Greece: The Meaning of the November Uprising," MONTHLY REVIEW, February 1974.

CLIVE THOMAS, Economics Department, University of Guyana, author of *Dependence and Transformation: The Economics of the Transition to Socialism,* to be published this summer.

—The Editors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM: LOOKING BACKWARD AND FORWARD

ALONSO AGUILAR

In the last 25 years Marxist thought has made some fundamental achievements which it would be a mistake to belittle. In stressing their importance, I have no intention of ignoring the flaws, vacillations, moments of confusion, and even the setbacks that have occurred. The road of science—not to mention that of revolution—is not an easy or straight one. The mere fact that Marxism has acquired a following of millions would be unexplainable if the theory had not progressed to the point of becoming, in more than one instance, a new social practice. Marxist thought has advanced the knowledge of the structure of matter, the interaction of the laws governing natural development and of those that make possible the practical application of scientific achievements. The Soviet Union's spectacular achievements in the space race, astrophysics, and nuclear physics are not accidental, nor are they mere expressions of our era's technological revolution. Nonetheless, it is the achievements in the social sciences that will be emphasized here.

Those who would criticize Marxism are often doing little more than rejecting stereotyped schematizations that actually bear no relationship to the theory, or putting forth the argument that socialism has not followed the course the classic Marxist thinkers prescribed for it. We grant that stereotypes and absolute formulas, depriving knowledge of its dialectical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character and Marxism of its creative force and scientific value, have been common shortcomings, even in the socialist countries. It would be a mistake, however, to confuse these simplifications with the more significant contributions. Marxist social science has broken with the formal harmonies characteristic of bourgeois science, and tries to make theory correspond to reality. Neoclassical economics and functionalist science are interested only in form, appearance, and the internal logic of their structures, even though these be completely divorced from all fact. Marxism is based on fact and knows that social theory can only come from it. As opposed to empiricism, which sees facts as given and disconnected, Marxism integrates facts within the historical process and places them in a dialectical perspective—as a whole and in their interrelationships and principal contradictions.

Working within this framework, Marxism elevates social science from the level of static equilibrium to the area of real, changing, and complex imbalances. It moves from the institutional to the strictly structural level: social relations of production and the economic structure of society.

Marx introduces into science the category of the "social formation [conceived] as a natural historical process." It is a totality, a system that evolves from preceding formations, not arbitrarily but according to laws that are ultimately the expression of a given mode of production or of the transition to another. Without this category, as Lenin said, there could be no social science. Its use allows us to understand the connection between the social relations of production and the growth of the productive forces, as well as discovering the laws that govern the historical process. It is the knowledge of these laws and the contradictions through which they are manifested that has made new theoretical advances possible in the explanation of development and underdevelopment, profound revolutionary upheavals, and the transition to socialism.

Against the conventional explanations of underdevelopment, which place the burden of guilt on its very victims, a theory is being forged from certain basic theses of Marx and Lenin. This is an integration of the phenomena of dependency and unequal development, the accumulation of capital and the international use of surplus, which proves that social laws are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not rigidly inflexible, that even the most general of them operate differently within different historical contexts. We can now prove that capitalism, which in other circumstances made development possible, is not only not an agent capable of freeing Third World nations from the backwardness, misery, and profound structural deformations from which they suffer, but that it is their principal cause, even if it is still promoting the anarchic and unequal growth of productive forces.

Perhaps Marxism's greatest achievement over the past 25 years has been the acceleration of the revolutionary process. The Second World War changed the international balance of forces. Although the bourgeoisie in Italy, Germany, Spain, Greece, and other countries was able to stop the revolution in these countries, it could not prevent the Soviet Union's consolidation, the crisis of colonialism, the transformation of Eastern Europe, and the victory of the revolution in China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and, years later, in Cuba, at imperialism's very doors.

It is totally unacceptable to suppose that this vast and renovating impulse was spontaneously produced and did not proceed from a strategy which in turn was the result of rigorous theoretical analysis. Without a correct understanding of each country's reality—seen in Leninist terms as a "concrete reality" —the practical problems involved in taking power or making the transition to socialism could never have been solved. Western theorists of the "industrial society" see socialism and capitalism drawing progressively closer together. They define this process as "convergence," or "integration," or other analogous schematizations that ignore the decisive influence of the mode of production. We decidedly do not believe in this possibility. Neither do we believe that the development of the socialist nations is increasingly divorcing theory from practice.

Socialist society during the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat is, of course, neither perfect nor idyllic. It suffers from multiple flaws, faces serious problems, and still exhibits traits that recall its recent capitalist past. The specific forms socialism adopts, on the other hand, do not correspond exactly to what the Marxist classics foresaw in their brilliant outlines. But rather than threatening the theory, these differences strengthen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and enrich it. Rather than entailing a divorce, it shows that life itself, practice, is always the principal source of knowledge; unless, of course, we make theory into something static, into a kind of gospel or inflexible mold to which reality must restrict itself, and turn Marx into a prophet instead of the scientist he was.

Never before in the course of history has a social change been accomplished with such speed. We are living in the revolutionary stage of the transition from capitalism to socialism, in which more than one billion human beings are forging a new society. Yet both the successful revolutions and those which at present still face insurmountable obstacles prove that radical change can occur only when, starting from certain objective conditions which are themselves the result of historical laws, it is possible to organize a daring and conscious political struggle to provide the subjective elements necessary to carry out a successful revolutionary rupture with the old order.

There is still much to be done, of course. We must, for example, acquire a deeper knowledge of the reality within which we must act. Only in this way can we define its most serious contradictions and exercise influence over the revolutionary process. We must study the workings of the laws of value and unequal development more rigorously, insofar as they both affect the course of the revolution, even in the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In conclusion, we must strengthen the theoretical struggle against reformism, systematically refute those bourgeois views that do the greatest damage to social science, take objective account of the changes in the composition and role of the proletariat, and make a deeper study of the forms that the labor/capital and capitalism/socialism contradictions assume.

Progress along these lines will help to avoid and correct errors; to struggle against schematizations; to avoid the temptation to construct "models" that are often more influenced by formal logic than by dialectics; to understand the events that generate and accentuate certain contradictions, as well as those that soften them; to see historical laws as such and not as natural forces; to use Marxist theory as a guide to action and not as a master key. In other words, to create a revolutionary strategy solidly based on a revolutionary theory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SAMIR AMIN

The last fifteen years will certainly be counted as important in the history of the development of socialist thought. The extraordinary rebirth of Marxism has indeed been in contrast to the crisis of a dominant ideology stricken with sterility. This rebirth follows a long empty period marked by Stalinist dogmatism, tempered by the extraordinary attraction that the technocratic ideology of triumphant "apoliticism" exercised, at first covertly, then openly from 1953 on. The eclectic compromises of the fifties flourished briefly; since at least 1965 a vigorous Marxist thought has begun to leave them far behind.

The first question that poses itself is: Why this renewal? In our opinion the reason should be sought in the development of the mass struggle for socialism, parallel with the deepening of the crisis of capitalism.[1]* For the development of Marxism is never the result of the autonomous progress of "academic" thought isolated from social reality. The orientation of China since 1950 (very different from that of the USSR), culminating in the Cultural Revolution, permitted for the first time a criticism from the Left of the Soviet experience. This appears to us to have been fundamental. Isn't it characteristic that up until

* Numbered notes will be found at the end of the article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then every critique of Soviet reality, even that of Trotskyism, was unable to differentiate itself from anti-Sovietism? The Twentieth Congress should have been the great revenge of Trotskyism, the base for its further progress. It had no such effect: the continuing sterility of Trotskyism is therefore our first observation. The reason for this comes from its inability to go beyond the deceased "prophet," for it remained in the economistic positions of his epoch. Trotsky's economism is testified to by his "regret" over the defeat of the German revolution, his affirmation of the necessity for "socialist accumulation" (i.e., "catching up in order to surpass"), thereby reproducing the types of division of labor specific to capitalism and breaking the worker-peasant alliance of 1917 in order to finance this model of industrialization at the expense of the peasantry, etc. On this terrain Stalin was the victor.

The Chinese experience allows us to transcend the narrow debate concerning the "methods" of this type of "socialist construction." In formulating from the beginning a radical critique of the objective—in other words, in refusing to reduce socialism to a "capitalism without capitalists" and, instead, in calling into question capitalist models of industrialization, technology, organization and hierarchy, of the division of labor, urbanization, consumption, education, etc., and in revealing the non-neutral character of these models, China had to view in a radically different manner the entire problematic of the transition to socialism.

This radical critique of the positivist economistic interpretation of Marxism, an interpretation which was triumphant in the period of the Second and Third Internationals, opened the way for a return to Marx. This return to Marx could of course find only a favorable echo in the developed West, where the Soviet model had little to offer. The dissatisfaction felt by the consumer-oriented masses in the West, the crisis of the civilization of mature capitalism, was able at last to express itself in authentically socialist demands. The fact that the world capitalist system had begun to enter a structural crisis even before Europe and Japan had "caught up" with the United States—that is to say, the fact that the economic base on which rested the prosperity of the last 25 years was collapsing—and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accentuation of social struggles which has accompanied this crisis since 1968 (notably in France and Italy) have opened the prospect of a profound renewal of Marxism.

At the same time, the Chinese experience made necessary a rethinking of the respective roles of the center and the periphery in the development of capitalism. The national liberation movements of the forties and the fifties, which left little margin of choice between the development of national capitalism and imitation of the Russian model, were bound to be replaced by the attraction of a new vision, reinforced by the successes of Vietnam. All of this prepared the way for a re-elaboration of the theory of the world system and of unequal development.

It is against this factual background that I would like to view the theoretical contributions of recent years. The intention here is not to enumerate all the fields that have benefited from this renewal, much less to provide an exhaustive bibliography of these contributions. I have neither the space nor the audacity to do that. Consequently my judgment may perhaps be biased, but I would like to indicate the lines of this renewal that appear to me to be the most essential and the most promising.

The critique of economism has allowed the rediscovery of the unity of Marxism, which is neither an economic theory, a sociological theory, nor a philosophy, but the social science of socialist revolutionary praxis. This critique starts from many points of departure, often modest. The internal critique of neoclassical economics, with which are associated the names of non-Marxists such as Sraffa,[2] was one point of departure. This critique undermined the attempts at an alleged synthesis of Marxism and marginalism which the attraction of the technocratic vision of the fifties inspired in the West as well as in Russia.[3] This attempt expressed, in fact, the class character of the Soviet mode of production and, concomitantly, the positivist reduction of Marxism. It culminated in the theory of the "convergence of the systems" in which Tinbergen saw the triumph, at last, of the "natural" laws of economics, independent of social systems. The bankruptcy of this eclecticism led to the re-opening of the question of the problem of the "transformation" of values into prices. This question was posed by Engels himself when, in the preface to the third volume of *Capital*, he invoked a positivist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interpretation of the problem, giving the law of value a real historical existence prior to that of prices of production. Further contributions were made on the question between 1910 and 1930—contributions which raised more questions than they answered—and then, beginning about 1930, the topic was buried. This problem, in our opinion, is closed today, precisely because the profound nature of the critique of economism has been rediscovered.[4] To go beyond these false questions the real nature of the relations between the ideological factor and the economic base must be understood; in particular, it must be understood that these relations are neither unilateral nor identical in the capitalist mode of production to the relations in those modes of production which historically preceded capitalism.[5]

The rediscovery of the works of the young Marx, particularly the *German Ideology,* was decisive here. This rediscovery was, moreover, thrust upon us from the time that the Chinese envisioned these relations in a manner entirely different from that to which the mechanistic Soviet approach had led. In this area there were decisive controversies. Althusser, in denying the Marxist character of alienation, made a final attempt to save Moscow, and yet he contributed by his very efforts to the definitive liquidation of the positivist heritage which he pushed to its extreme limits.[6] In our opinion this decisive progress allows us to say that a series of essential questions concerning historical materialism are settled, notably questions concerning modes of production, social formations, the articulation and domination of modes, the nature of the dialectical relation between the superstructure and the infrastructure, the nature of precapitalist religious alienation and of capitalist market alienation.

It was in this way that the break with economism was made. One could pose correctly a whole series of problems, of which I will indicate at least the following: (1) The analysis of capitalism in the contemporary center, its particular mode of reproduction at a stage in which the contradiction between the social character of the level of development of the forces of production and the restrictive character of the relations of production makes it necessary to go beyond the reproduction schemes of Volume 2 of *Capital* to envision the active intervention of the state in the process (an analysis begun by Baran

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Sweezy, to whom we owe the useful concept of the "surplus" of contemporary monopoly capitalism).[7] (2) The analysis of class alliances in the history of capitalism and their transformations in relation to political and ideological history, particularly that of social democracy.[8] (3) The critical evaluation of the strategies of the workers' movement resulting from (1) and (2), and particularly a critique of "frontism" and the forms of working-class organization defined by Lenin in *What Is to Be Done?* (a critique developed in Italy by the *Manifesto* group). (4) The critique of contemporary capitalism in its different aspects, principally the division of labor and its devastating effects, of urbanism, etc.[9] (5) The critique of the eclectic attempts of Freudo-Marxism (Reich) and of the Frankfurt School (the Marcusian philosophy of *One-Dimensional Man,* the aesthetics of Adorno, etc.), hardly begun; corresponding to these new fields of Marxist insight, the evaluation of the irruption of youth (and of the problems of the functions of education in reproduction), of feminism, etc. (6) Last but not least, the analysis of the unequal development of capitalism and the discussion concerning the periodization of the history of the world system.

Because it was evident that the Russian experience had been surpassed on the far left by China, it was the entire problematic of the world system that had to be re-examined. The obstacle on which Trotskyism had foundered could now be overcome. Here again the movement began from modest points of departure, related to real social changes, notably "national liberation" and efforts at "development." The failure of development strategies which accepted the axiom of integration into a world system (the populism and *desarrollismo* of Latin America) led to the formulation of the "theory of dependence," a formulation which was still confused, semi-Marxist, and semi-nationalist.[10] The meager results from the transposition of the lessons of the USSR to the "Third World" (which is the content of the "non-capitalist" way, of which Egypt is the clearest example) insistently called for putting in question the linear vision of historical development, which is common to the bourgeois scientistic ideology and to dogmatic pseudo-Marxism. At the same time there began the crisis of the world system through which we have lived since the Second World War, obliging us

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to re-examine received ideas concerning the periodization of the system's history. It seems to me that in all these areas decisive progress has been made in recent years. From an analysis (still in limited terms) of models of reproduction on the scale of the world system in its entirety, which has nevertheless permitted the clear elucidation of the concepts of the center and the periphery and the integration of contributions until then scattered and poorly formulated (such as that concerning unequal exchange[11]), one has been led to restudy the history of the birth, the development, and the transcendence of capitalism on a world scale. The Eurocentric point of view has finally been transcended, and attempts have been made to produce general formulations in terms of the unequal development of civilizations. At the same time ancient debates, launched 50 years too soon, have reappeared on the scene. The rediscovery of Chayanov and of the debate concerning the modes of production called "Asiatic," should be included in the list of areas of decisive progress.

We will stop here to avoid excessive length, fully aware that we have not given an exhaustive account of progress resulting from the extraordinary renaissance of Marxism, aware also (and above all) that the lines of development of this renewal in the future depend principally on the vigor of the action of the masses which the deepening of the crisis will certainly entail.

Our personal contribution to this renewal can be found in essence in *Le développement inégal* (now in its second edition).* This is not the place to account for the route which led from a largely economistic critique—which remained within the framework of both conventional economic theory (in particular treatment of underdevelopment)[12] and the experiences of the politics of "'development"[13]—to a unified formulation which, despite its limitations, seems to us to have really returned to Marx. We have nothing essential to add currently to the different chapters of this work devoted to the ambitious project of systematically setting forth our current perspective.

Certain chapters of this work seem to us to be by way of an introduction which call for further debate; others, in con-

* To be published in English by Monthly Review Press in 1975.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trast, are by way of concluding a debate which we think is closed (at least provisionally, since everything is sooner or later transcended).

We would like to begin by noting the principal debates which appear closed, precisely because, in rediscovering Marx, one can hope to have definitely buried the economism of the Second and Third Internationals. The first debate is that concerning the nature of the relations between ideology and the infrastructure in precapitalist modes of production and the reaffirmation of the problem of alienation in the capitalist mode. It is on this basis that one must, in our opinion, formulate simultaneously what is the communist project on the one hand and the Orwellian perspective of *1984* on the other.[14] It is also in relation to this reformulation that we consider closed the false economistic debate concerning the "transformation" of values into prices.[15] This latter is the debate concerning the law of accumulation and the status of the value of labor power. Here again we considered it necessary to distinguish the level on which the analysis is being conducted: the dialectic of objective forces (the models of accumulation in Volume 2 of *Capital*) and subjective forces (class struggle) cannot be examined in the same manner at the abstract level of the capitalist mode of production as at the concrete level of the capitalist formations of the center (where the struggle and alliances of classes must be dealt with), at the level of the world capitalist system as a whole. This formulation which we have proposed more systematically in our last work (*L'échange inégal et la loi de la valeur* [Unequal Exchange and the Law of Value], in our opinion definitely settles the question of international unequal exchange by bringing forth the pre-eminence of world values. At the same time the question is settled, we believe, of the critique of conventional "economics" (and its manner of viewing the problems of money, the cycle, competition, etc.) and of the technocratic technology. A third family of debates equally closed is that concerning the discussions of underdevelopment. We have now gone far beyond the gross stupidities of Rostow, both in their American version and in that of Moscow. We definitely understand the functions that periphery has filled in the course of the process of the world-wide expansion of capitalism,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nature and the forms of "dependence" and of unequal international specializations, etc.

Those are the settled questions. By contrast the problems raised in the first chapter of *Unequal Development* consist of a statement, intended to be coherent and systematic, of a hypothesis situated in the framework of historical materialism. It is thus that our system of concepts must be understood: modes of production, social formations, articulations of modes and domination of one among them, etc. This system seems to us to have permitted the formulation of the problems both of the birth of capitalism and of its decadence and its transcendence.

It is in this general direction that we propose to extend *Unequal Development*. We will certainly not do it here, in this afterword, but we will indicate the areas of our current preoccupation.

The first of these concerns is the reformulation of the periodization of the history of capitalism. We see two sets of periods. One is periods of expansion (1815-1840, 1850-1870, 1890-1914, 1948-1967) characterized simultaneously by a pattern of accumulation (leading industries, form of competition, status of the firm), a corresponding type of class struggle and alliances which defines the nature of political life, a pattern of the system's expansionism and of hierarchization which determines the role of the periphery and the nature of international relations. The others are the periods of crisis and reconstruction (1840-1850, 1870-1890, 1914-1948, 1967 onward) which constitute the passage from one pattern to another.

It is in relation to this problematic of periodization that we want to view the question of the decadence of the capitalist system and of the present crisis. Concerning this decadence, we think its nature and forms of expression should be looked for as much in its expansionary phase which is coming to an end (1948-1967, which we call the "time of illusion") as in the two periods of crisis (1914-1948, and 1967 onward).

The analysis of the current crisis is our dominant preoccupation. The debate on the alternatives—*1984* (in the singular or plural) versus new openings in the direction of socialism—and the examination from this point of view of the strategies relevant to southern Europe, the Arab world, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa are current and urgent matters. It is furthermore in order to be able clearly to understand this area that we have thought it necessary to complete *Unequal Development* by a study of the relations between the capitalist mode of production and agriculture, a study which we hope to bring to a conclusion very soon. We propose there a re-reading of *Capital* (noting that the chapters concerning the rent of land invite the passage from the framework of the capitalist mode of production to that of capitalist social formations) and a new critical reading of Kautsky, Lenin, and Chayanov on the "agrarian question."

The second area that the development of historical materialism implies concerns the deepening of the examination of the relationship between ideology and infrastructure. The critique of Freudo-Marxism and of the Frankfurt School is on the agenda here.

Finally, before leaving the reader—who will, we hope, wish to evaluate *Unequal Development* with a view to showing its necessary extensions—we would like to correct a point of view which is expressed therein. This concerns the USSR and Eastern Europe, which, we have said, were part of the world capitalist market, without at the same time belonging to the world capitalist system. Our friend Andre Gunder Frank has justly criticized us on this point: in declaring their desire for a greater integration between their external economic relations and their national economies, the leaders of this region of the world are clearly stating that their countries belong to the world capitalist system.

NOTES

1. In our opinion, an essential part of the discussion of the next few years must be the analysis of this, and an analysis of the nature of the alternation of the phases of expansion (1814-1845, 1850-1870, 1890-1914, 1948-1967) and of crises of restructuration (1840-1850, 1870-1890, 1914-1948, 1970 onward)—more specifically, the nature of the decadence of the system (which we trace back to 1914) and of the particular features which result from this decadence in the phases 1914-1918 and 1948-1967, as well as in the new phase which has opened.
2. Piero Sraffa, *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. These eclectic efforts of Oscar Lange and of Kantorovitch, vulgarized later by the "liberal" school of Liberman, Brus, and Sik went bankrupt theoretically and practically, when compared with the Western workers' movement, but they evidently remain the basis for what is left of "Soviet Marxism."
4. See Samir Amin, *L'échange inégal et la loi de la valeur* (Paris: Anthropos, 1973).
5. See Samir Amin, *Le développement inégal,* chapter 1 (Paris: Minuit 1973).
6. *For Marx* (New York, 1970); *Reading Capital* (New York, 1971).
7. Paul Baran, *Political Economy of Growth* (Monthly Review Press, 1962); P. Baran and P. Sweezy, *Monopoly Capital* (Monthly Review Press, 1966).
8. P. P. Rey, *Les alliances de classe* (Paris: Maspero, 1973).
9. See especially the decisive contribution of Henri Lefebvre in this area.
10. This critique was developed in Latin America by Andre Gunder Frank, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Aníbal Quijano, Alonso Aguilar, and others.
11. See Samir Amin, *L'échange inégal et la loi de la valeur.*
12. A route begun in 1957 by our work on "The Integration of Precapitalist Economies into the World Economy" (Thesis, Paris).
13. See our work on the Maghreb, West Africa, the Ivory Coast, Guinea, Ghana, Mali, and the Congo.
14. We have formulated this alternative in "L'Éloge du socialisme," *L'Homme et la Société* (first trimester 1974).
15. A point developed in *L'échange inégal et la loi de la valeur.*

JAMES AND GRACE LEE BOGGS

Twenty-five years ago the main contradiction in the world appeared to be that between the capitalist camp, under the leadership of the United States, and the socialist camp, under the leadership of Soviet Russia. In this "cold war," revolutionary minded individuals all over the world sympathized with or supported the Soviet Union. The nationalist leaders of the Third World countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America not only took advantage of the conflict to advance their own struggles for independence; they also looked forward to follow-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the Russian model towards rapid economic development after winning independence.

In Western Europe and the United States radicals were still expecting, as they had been since 1917, that their revolutions would follow the Russian scenario. Marxist thinking for them consisted chiefly of doctrinaire disputes over passages from Marx, Engels, and/or Lenin, all allegedly supporting or contradicting Russia's claim to be defended as a workers' state, Stalin's (or Trotsky's) claim to the mantle of Lenin, and/or conflicting proposals for action to mobilize their own working classes for revolution.

Today we should know better. First of all, in the last 25 years we have witnessed the success of other revolutions—the Chinese, the Cuban, the Vietnamese, the North Korean—all of whose scenarios have been quite different from that of the Russian Revolution, despite deceptively similar formulations. Each of these revolutions has expanded our conception of what a revolution involves and deepened the concept of socialism far beyond anything that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, or Trotsky could possibly have envisaged.

Second, we have witnessed the transformation of Soviet Russia into a bureaucratic and materialistic society increasingly indistinguishable from the United States, and hence a deepening contradiction within the socialist camp between the Russian and the Chinese theory and practice of socialism.

And, most important, in the last ten years we ourselves have been faced with real rebellions and real social crises in this country, a nation so technologically advanced and militarily powerful that it bears no resemblance to prerevolutionary Russia, prerevolutionary China, prerevolutionary Cuba, or indeed any other country in which there has been a successful revolution.

Of course, there are still many little groups, especially on or near university campuses, for whom the Russian Revolution remains the last word and who still quote from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin (or Trotsky) with the fanaticism of the preacher quoting from the Bible. Others are now carrying on a similar ritual with the works of Mao or Castro or Ho or Cabral. These radicals are dogmatists, living by ideas in books. They have no conception of the dialectical method of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thinking which was Marx's landmark contribution to revolutionary theory.

Dialectical thinking cannot be taught; it can only be learned through practice. At this point in history the *first* practical step that a revolutionary minded person can take toward internalizing the dialectical method is to struggle to understand the tremendous historical developments which have taken place *on both sides*—the side of capitalism and the side of socialist struggle—in the more than 125 years since Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* and the more than 55 years since the October Revolution. The *second* practical step for American would-be revolutionaries is to *start* grappling with the question of how to make an American revolution and *stop* talking so much about the revolutions taking place elsewhere in the world. All these revolutions are very important, but we in the United States cannot determine their direction. Hence, preoccupation with them only reinforces the already powerful tendency of the radical intellectual to idealism and/or the tendency to turn living ideas into dogmas and abstractions.

When the ideas of an individual have had such a powerful influence on human development as Marx's have had, it becomes necessary to draw a sharp distinction between the ideas and the method by which they were developed. Marx's bold theoretical conceptions were based upon his concrete perceptions of the contradictions developing in the industrializing capitalism of nineteenth-century Europe. The socialism which he projected was a socialism to resolve the contradictions of that capitalism.

Today we know how far Lenin had to go beyond Marx in his thinking, because he was engaged in making a twentieth-century revolution in his own country, Russia. Lenin advanced beyond Marx not only in his theory and practice of the vanguard party but also in his concept of imperialism and the role of the national liberation struggles against imperialist oppression. Marx could not possibly have created these concepts, because in his time capitalism itself had not developed to the historical stage of imperialism and because Marx was not continuously engaged in trying to make a revolution in a particular country. Thus, Marxist-Leninist thinking was an advance beyond Marx's thinking.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, not until the actual practice of Marxist-Leninist thinking had led in Russia to the concrete reality of a workers' state was Lenin faced with the need to tackle the contradictions within the concept of socialism itself. When Lenin died, he was just beginning to realize how the mobilization of the masses to seize power and expropriate the bourgeoisie was only the first stage of the socialist revolution. Just because the Russian masses had been militant enough to overthrow the landlords and the capitalists did not mean that they had rid themselves of bourgeois values, i.e., of concern only with economic self-interest. It did not mean that they had acquired socialist values, i.e., a readiness to put politics in command or to accept full political and social responsibility for creating a socialist society in Russia.

The Chinese Communists, like their European counterparts, began by trying to make a revolution on the Russian model. Only after the Shanghai massacre of 1927 did Mao begin to appreciate how necessary it is for each revolutionary party to base its struggles on the unique historical development and hence the unique contradictions of the particular country. Finally, in 1949, after a protracted struggle very different from that of the Bolsheviks, because it involved transformation of the masses in the cause of the struggle for power, the Chinese Communists were able to take power. Since that time they have consciously sought to prevent the encroachment of bourgeois values which has obviously taken place in the Soviet Union in the course of rapid economic development. To do this, they have integrated ethics with the work process and with politics. Relying upon themselves, and not upon fate or other external forces, people at the grassroots level throughout China have been encouraged to put into *both* the process of production *and* the process of political decision-making, their previously untapped human potential for ingenuity, persistence, cooperation, the ability to learn from practice and from each other, political consciousness, and social responsibility. At the same time the Communist Party continues to raise the political consciousness of the people by making clear the continuing contradiction or class struggle—which must take place in *every* socialist society and in *every* individual in an economically developing society—between the bourgeois outlook (the social irresponsibility of putting economics in command of politics) and the socialist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outlook (the social responsibility of putting politics in command of economics). Periodically, when rapid economic growth has increased the threat of bourgeois thinking, Mao has launched revolutionary class struggles on a massive scale against those in the higher echelons of industry, government, and party, most spectacularly in the Cultural Revolution of 1966-1968. In these ways the Chinese Revolution has now enriched the whole concept of the struggle for socialism to include a vision of hundreds of millions of new politically conscious and socially responsible men, women, and children who can only develop themselves by ceaseless self-criticism as well as criticism, continuing self-reliance to adapt technology to people rather than the other way around, and periodic revolutions.

While the theory and practice of socialism has been making these tremendous advances, capitalism (which is also a system struggling to maintain and expand itself) has not been standing still. In order to negate its contradictions at home and abroad, modern capitalism has assumed the forms of neocolonialism, the military-industrial complex, and multinational capitalism. As these transformations have expanded the sphere of influence of capitalism in an *outward* direction, they have also enabled capitalism to move *downward*, i.e., to incorporate into the system many of those who Marx thought would be so antagonized by capitalist exploitation that they would organize themselves into a social force to overthrow the system. Unless we struggle to understand this dialectical development taking place on the side of capitalism, we will be constantly expecting capitalism to collapse under the weight of its own contradictions and/or the rebellions of militant masses, when, in fact, militant rebellions that do not advance to revolutions only increase the number of those incorporated into the individualistic and materialistic (i.e., dehumanizing) values of capitalism.

Those radicals who continue to agitate the masses to fight against old forms of exploitation and old grievances, when new and more sophisticated forms of dehumanization have been developed by a capitalist system which is itself developing dialectically, are actually acting like liberals. Constantly urging the masses to escalate their demands for more of the economic reforms which capitalism has already found ways to grant, they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help capitalism to increase its ideological domination over the masses. By encouraging the masses to see themselves only as victims of the system with no responsibility either for their own action or those of the system, they also prevent them from developing revolutionary political consciousness, i.e., consciousness of their responsibility to take power from those who run the society in order to build a new socialist system based on new human values. Without such a revolutionary consciousness on the part of vast sections of the population, and especially those who have been most oppressed by the system, no revolution can possibly succeed at this stage of capitalist development.

The present continuing crisis in the United States provides us with an unprecedented opportunity as well as awesome responsibility to create the unique revolutionary ideology, organization, and programs (*in that order*) necessary to create a new socialist nation out of the United States, a nation of which every American, regardless of race, sex, or national origin, could be proud. For this revolution there are no models.

The greatest challenge to Marxist thinking at this period in history is the creation of a revolutionary ideology for the United States out of a dialectical analysis of the unique historical development and therefore the unique contradictions of this country. Not only has there never been a successful socialist revolution in any advanced country: the United States is the most advanced of all advanced capitalist countries and also the citadel of world capitalism upon whose continuing existence depends the survival of capitalism in all its many forms: as a police state in South Africa, South Vietnam, and many Latin American republics, or as a parliamentary democracy in Italy, West Germany, Japan, and Israel. Moreover, unlike the developed capitalist nations of Western Europe, the United States as a nation is only 200 years old. Except for the native Americans, everyone now living in this country is a descendant of someone who came here from another continent and another culture less than 400 years ago—in most cases, much less. The ancestors of most of us were not among those who, only 200 years ago, established the economic, political, and social patterns by which this country has developed to its present state. The American people as a whole have never engaged in the revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary struggles by which any great nation is created. That great politicizing, socializing, and humanizing experience still lies before us.

Unlike the peoples of Europe and Asia, the people of the United States do not share the long past of common social struggles against tribalism and feudalism which elsewhere have created a sense of national unity and social cohesion. From the very beginning and up into the twentieth century, the total labor force of this country had to be imported, either by force or by promises, because the native Americans would not work for the early settlers and were eventually put into concentration camps.

The blacks came in chains. Not only were they torn away from their families, their land, and their culture; they were also robbed of the opportunity to develop Africa and themselves through social struggles against their tribal chiefs and witch-doctors. Europeans, who came voluntarily, in successive waves of immigration, were not only seeking new opportunities for themselves as individuals; they were also running away from the social struggles necessary to resolve the contradictions in the nations they left behind. That is why they found it so easy upon their arrival to ignore the racist oppression to which blacks were obviously being subjected. They came here in the first place because they believed that progress in this country did not demand social struggles but was dependent upon individual courage and energy. Individuals of exceptional enterprise themselves, they found it easy to accept the philosophy of exceptionalism, materialism, and individualism characteristic of U.S. capitalism. Once here, the actual opportunities for the upward social mobility of the individual and of successive ethnic groups systematically reinforced this concept of the socially irresponsible and opportunistic individual.

The first opportunity to strike a major blow at this bourgeois outlook came with the Great Depression. For the first time in the brief history of this nation a huge social force was ripe for political agitation and propaganda for social struggle against capitalism. It was at this juncture that U.S. radicals expected a revolution to take place here along the lines of the Russian scenario. However, instead of falling apart as the Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sian ruling class had done in 1917, U.S. capitalism was able to overcome the antagonism of the masses with massive social reform programs, such as WPA, welfare, and social security, until the Second World War once again provided full employment.

From this experience radicals should have learned that spontaneous rebellions are not enough to create a revolution in any country. But most of them are still looking forward to another recession or depression, in the futile hope that this will rouse the masses to another explosion like the sitdowns of the 1930s and that this time members of their particular faction will be around in sufficient numbers to escalate the spontaneous mass struggles to uncontrollable heights. Meanwhile, U.S. capitalism has been expanding outward and downward, incorporating more and more of the masses into the values of the system every time it grants another wage increase or fringe benefit to a particular rebellious group.

The next opportunity to strike a major blow at this bourgeois outlook came after the black underclass erupted suddenly in the middle 1960s. Coinciding with the crisis of United States intervention in Vietnam, the black movement soon became a self-developing movement, drawing into social struggle ever-increasing numbers of blacks, young whites, liberals, other ethnic minorities, and women. However, in the absence of a unifying revolutionary ideology, organization, and program (again, in that order) to confront all these groups with the need to struggle against their own bourgeois outlook, each of these rebellious groups (following the black example) has concentrated on winning concessions for itself, regardless of what this might mean for the whole society. The result is that U.S. capitalism has now succeeded in incorporating the most articulate and militant elements from each group into the system through its many pacification programs.

The course of the black movement over the last 20 years shows how U.S. capitalism is able to strengthen itself and weaken the struggle against it as long as there is no systematic struggle within each group against the bourgeois outlook of social irresponsibility and opportunism as the first step toward socialist revolution.

The black movement started out in the belief that racism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the only contradiction in the society and that if blacks could only win equal opportunity to advance in the system, blacks and whites would end up equal. In the course of two decades of struggle, i.e., in the course of social practice, it has become clear that racism is not the sole contradiction in the United States and that it is inseparable from the capitalist contradictions which arise from each group advancing itself at the expense of others, and/or individuals using the grievances of masses within their group to advance themselves.

The more nationalistic the black movement has become, the easier it has been for capitalism to incorporate blacks into the system. Because the more nationalistic the black movement has become, the more blacks have insisted that "all we care about are blacks—and the hell with everybody else." Thus in the course of only 20 years, both the integrationists, who wanted only to reform the system so that blacks could be included in capitalist exploitation, and the nationalists, who claimed to be against the system, have gradually adopted the values of the system and been brought into the system, assuming responsibility for it and the chaos which the system continues to create.

The nationalists ended up by going into the system because they made the mistake of thinking that nationalism in and of itself is a revolutionary ideology, when in fact nationalism is only the stage when all layers of oppressed groups—the petty bourgeoisie, workers, farmers, and lumpen—come to the conclusion that they have shared a common oppression and have a common history. In the United States, nationalism was an inevitable stage in the development of black struggle because throughout the history of this country blacks have been kept at the bottom of this society as blacks, i.e., on a racial basis. But ever since the black-power movement erupted in the late 1960s, the need has been for black revolutionaries to develop a revolutionary ideology for this entire country. Instead of doing this, black militants began to look toward Africa and idealize the past. Instead of projecting the fundamental changes which would have to be made in this country—which would inevitably benefit not only blacks but everybody else—they began to think of themselves as living in some metaphysical space.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They began to insist that blacks in this country are Third World people like the people living in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, when in fact blacks are living inside the United States and benefiting from the exploitation by the United States of the Third World. They refused to face the reality that black GIs were raping and massacring in Vietnam just like white GIs, or that blacks are an integral part of that 5 percent of the world's population living in the United States and consuming 40 percent of the world's energy resources for their big cars and new appliances, just as whites are doing.

Unwilling to face the challenge of bringing about fundamental changes in this country, black militants have drifted steadily into bourgeois methods of thought and bourgeois practices, while the black masses are drifting back to superstition and religion. The result is that blacks today are no different from whites in seeking individual advancement based upon the capitalist principle that all individuals can "make it" in the system, if only they are ready to use others to get there, exploiting even those closest to them in the most degrading ways, from the pimp on the street to the politician seeking office. Meanwhile, instead of confronting this growing criminal mentality among black people, black militants have been making excuses for it—thus helping this criminal mentality to become even more widespread among black children and youth.

In the year 1974, blacks all over the country are bragging about how many black mayors have been elected, while practically every black university graduate who can get together a few hundred dollars is running for one office or another. In terms of numbers, this looks like progress for black people. But in terms of grappling with the fundamental issues that confront this country and everybody inside it, including blacks—crime, the energy crisis, corruption at all levels of government, mental illness—this rash of black politicians only means that more blacks are caught up in the system of bourgeois politics. Just like white politicians, they are now reluctant to raise any of the real questions which involve a choice between the bourgeois road and the socialist road. If they did, they might not get elected or re-elected to office, which is their main aim. Thus the elevation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of blacks into the system has weakened the black movement and the overall struggle for real change in this country—even though on the surface it may seem to have strengthened it.

There is nothing to be learned from bemoaning the past or wondering what might have happened if the working class of the thirties or the black movement of the sixties and seventies had done differently. That kind of metaphysical speculation is a waste of time for those really interested in making a revolution. However, there is much to be learned from what has now happened. The fact that both workers through their unions and blacks through their organizations have now been incorporated into the system of bourgeois politics and bourgeois values makes the fundamental reasons for a socialist revolution in the United States much clearer than they could possibly have been thirty or even ten years ago. It is much easier now to confront the members of every oppressed group, whether these be workers, blacks, or members of any other minority, with the choice between the two antagonistic roads: *the bourgeois road*, by which the few advance at the expense of the many and human development is subordinated to technological development, vs. the *socialist road*, which involves a continuing struggle to advance the political and human development of the majority over and above the pressure for material expansion and the interests of the few.

Those who are ready to take responsibility to make a socialist revolution in this country cannot start by taking a poll of the masses to see if they are ready to make this choice. Nor can they just wait for the masses to rebel and then rush in to become their spokesmen, as radicals did in the thirties and black militants did in the sixties. The masses, black or white, are full of internal contradictions. They can only acquire the strength to fight against their external enemy by first struggling against their own internalization of the values of this enemy. No potential revolutionary social force has ever become an actual revolutionary social force except through struggle to overcome its own internal contradictions.

As we move into the last quarter of the twentieth century, the black and white masses of this country have taken one im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant step on the road to socialist revolution. Through rebellions, strikes, riots, they have rid themselves of the physical fear of standing up to their oppressors. Now we must confront them with the need to embark on the philosophical and political struggles which every people with hope for their future have always embarked on at great turning points in their history. These philosophical and political struggles must revolve around the most advanced conceptions of the evolutionary potential of humankind. They must also lead to clear distinctions between rebellion and revolution, between being revolutionary and being a revolutionist, between a potential revolutionary social force and an actual revolutionary social force, and between the *liberal politics* which perpetuates a slave mentality in the oppressed by encouraging them only to protest against their condition and demand reforms from their oppressors and the *revolutionary politics* which calls upon the oppressed to assume the awesome responsibility of taking on an enemy as corrupting and as destructive of human potential as U.S. capitalism.

The historical process has already provided us with many lessons. Foremost among them is the lesson that revolutions don't just happen. Spontaneous rebellions or organized insurrections don't necessarily lead to revolution. Encouraging a victim mentality in the masses will not lead to revolution; it will more likely result in their greater domination by the system. Being a revolutionary and being a revolutionist represent two different stages of consciousness and practice. A revolutionary is *for* revolution; revolutionists have ideas of the tomorrow to which they are ready to lead the masses in struggle. Revolutionists have ideas, organizations, and programs; masses have needs and wants. Revolutionists take responsibility for developing the philosophy, ideology, organization, and programs (*in that order*) to develop the vanguard forces to help the masses to move from perception to conception, from complaint and protest to revolutionary struggle. This they can do only by confronting their own internal contradictions which act as a fetter on their ability to triumph over their enemies.

No two countries have undergone the same historical process of development. A revolution is both a continuation and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a profound departure from the past. It is the struggle by which human beings in a particular country, with particular contradictions, lift the entire nation, and thereby all humankind, to a new plateau of human development.

To develop the philosophy, ideology, organization, and programs for a revolution in an advanced capitalist country like the United States will require more advanced ideas than have yet been conceived by men and women. A revolution in the United States will create the highest stage of evolution yet achieved by humankind.

HARRY BRAVERMAN

Marxism is an enterprise in social investigation and in that sense a field of study, of scholarship, of science. It propounds questions for analysis and attempts to answer them, and does both by means of an approach and methodology more or less peculiar to itself. But Marxism is of course much more than this. Its origins and its principal modes of existence have been intimately bound up with a revolutionary movement to reconstitute society. Its successes and its failures have thus always been judged by standards very different from those of the academic world. They have been judged in the arena of political action. And from this point of view, Marxism as a theory of revolutionary change has been in a condition of extreme crisis for a number of decades.

Not that Marxism has not had its great successes during these decades. In the so-called underdeveloped countries—those colonies, former colonies, and neocolonies of imperialism which go by the inexact but now popular name of the Third World—there have been important successful revolutions whose leader-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ships have been Marxist, and there clearly will be more of these. Nationalist rebellions have spread in the Third World during the past three-quarters of a century as the inevitable response to imperialism. And the connection between these rebellions and Marxism lies in the fact that old-fashioned nationalism—nationalism which aims at the creation of new capitalist states—has proved its futility. Such nationalism is incapable of carrying through successful anti-imperialist revolutions, and thus the people of the Third World have turned increasingly to an ideology of anti-*capitalism* as the only serious form of anti-*colonialism*. This has brought about a fresh application of Marxism in the Third World, an application foreshadowed as recently as fifty years ago only in some of the collateral ideas of Marx, Lenin, and a few others, rather than in the main thrust of their analytical work.

The fact that Marxism has been developed and enriched by this Third World revolutionary practice may, it seems to me, be readily verified. The Marxist literature on imperialism, development and underdevelopment, and colonial or nationalist revolt is relatively plentiful. What is more important is that this literature, despite its unevenness, carries significant authority: in relatively large circles, both intellectual and activist, it dominates the discussion. Whatever its faults, it is today the liveliest part of Marxist expression and analysis, and the manner in which it thrives reflects its usefulness in practice.

In the centers of world capitalism, on the other hand, Marxism has long been searching for a new orientation adequate to the changed conditions of modern monopoly capitalism, and thus adequate to restore the Marxist political movement as an active revolutionary force. This crisis of modern Marxism began with the collapse of the Second International when confronted by the First World War. Although, thanks chiefly to Lenin and his cadre, the movement was able to snatch from the jaws of this collapse the victory of the Russian Revolution, and thus was able to emerge from the war with the beginnings of a new International, the seeds of future trouble were present. Now for the first time the European proletarian movement was deeply divided; only a minority supported the new Revolution and International, and much of the organized working class looked

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on in confusion. This division made it impossible for the working class to capitalize on the repeated inter-war crises of European capitalism to win power anywhere on the Continent. The powerlessness of the working class was exacerbated by the policies followed by the two wings of the movement—predictably as far as Social Democracy was concerned. The collapse of the Communist movement, especially in Germany, was less predictable and much more shocking. By the late thirties the crisis of the new International was well matured. The Communist movement had suffered a number of defeats, the most important of which had taken place in Germany and Spain, and had apparently abandoned the path of revolution for that of collaboration with "friendly" bourgeois governments in the form of Popular Frontism. At the same time, the Soviet Communist Party had been convulsed by a series of crises and purges in which much of the Old Guard of Bolshevism was eliminated; and this had taken the form not of an ideological confrontation, but of a mysterious set of accusations which required the followers of Soviet Communism to believe that many of their most able and popular leaders had gone over to fascism. This period was capped by the Soviet government's allying itself with Hitler in a pact that was broken only at the will of the latter. Among the collateral effects of the period was the virtual destruction of political independence in most of the non-Soviet Communist parties, and the substitution of ritual faith for Marxist analysis, since the Soviet party could continue to command a following on no other basis.

But it was in the fifties that the crisis of world Communism broke in full force. In the Second World War and its aftermath, the Communist movement proved unable to consolidate, in the form of successful revolutions, its wartime popularity as leaders of the resistance in any countries except those—Yugoslavia and China—where its leaders flouted the advice they received from the center of world Communism. Then the simmering scandal of the purge trials and the manner in which the Soviet party and government were led and directed became public in the Khrushchev revelations. And finally, in some ways most important of all, the long-accruing changes in capitalism, changes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which created an entirely new arena of analysis and struggle, cut the ground from under those Marxists who continued to repeat old slogans, and turned the familiar battle cries of Communism into futile incantations.

It was this last that proved the most telling blow, because it made a simple "return to Leninism" inadequate to the needs of the movement. Thus it sealed the doom of traditional Communism in all its forms, including those tiny oppositional currents such as Trotskyism which had not shared in the responsibility for Stalinism, but which assumed, simplistically, that reverting to the policies of the pre-Stalinist congresses of the Communist International would at one stroke repair the damage and open a new path forward.

The fact was that the entire monolithic edifice of Communism had been splintered, in part because it had been undermined, politically and morally, by a series of disastrous events and policies, and in part because in the interim the whole historical epoch for which this movement had been shaped had passed it by. This is not to say, I hasten to add as forcibly as I can, that traditional Communism was now suspect in all its parts, or in its basic animating drives—and still less so was traditional Marxism. But it is to say that a movement—the temporary repository of Marxism, as had been two Internationals before it—a movement with its own total analysis of the world, its "line," its slogans, its style, its habits of organization, its way of making itself heard, had come to the end of its historic path. From that point on, any attempts to preserve it intact would mean speaking to the problems of today with the thinking of yesterday. A new movement would have to draw on a fresh Marxist analysis of capitalism, imperialism, the working class, and socialist revolution in its own epoch, and apply the consequent view of the world to the problems of movement and party building.

The clearest demonstration of this is found in the fact that when the first new pulse of rebellion beat through the Western world in the sixties, it did not take its course by way of any of the traditional groupings of Communism, but treated them with impatience and often contempt. The new movement

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of intellectuals, student youth, women, and of specially oppressed national and racial groups, views Marxism with the best will in the world, but finds little of interest in its "official" versions and has been thus drawn to canonize the heretics rather than the apostles of the church (with, it must be said, uneven results, since a mixed diet of Korsch, Gramsci, Lukacs, Marcuse, Pannekoek, Reich, etc., whatever "insights" it may offer, is hardly a substitute for the systematic analysis that remains to be made).

This movement, for all its lack of development, is the most favorable and important of all developments in radicalism in the capitalist countries since the thirties, both as a precious sign that modern capitalism, for all its changes, continues to generate its own adversaries who display that revolutionary passion which can change worlds, and as a harbinger of bigger and more popular movements in the future. Yet the Communist parties and groups of all descriptions, instead of remembering and learning from the old Marxist watchword that every real movement is worth a thousand programs, reacted with ill-concealed dismay to the unexpected and unorthodox forms of the new radicalism, and breathed more easily only when the wave began to recede and they could recruit among the baffled remnants.

This movement and its successors to come, which will next time embrace portions of the modern working class, badly require that "theory" without which, as we have so often been told, there can be no successful revolutionary practice. But what is such a theory, and what must it provide? Briefly, this may be summarized under four headings:

First, a coherent explanation of how the various problems, oppressions, crises, and degradations characteristic of modern society are attributable to capitalism in a state of decline.

Second, a satisfactory analysis of the decline of capitalism, and the crisis-forms characteristic of capitalism in this epoch.

Third, a representation of the goals of the movement, and a differentiation of these goals from the transitional forms that have appeared since the First World War: this requires a better analysis of Soviet society, in particular, than has been available in recent decades.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fourth, and most important, a *perspective*: it is through its perspective, its view of how it gets from where it is to where it wants to go, that a movement finds its guide to action; and a theory, unless it can serve as a guide to action, is worthless.

The enormous authority enjoyed by Marxism as a theory during the heyday of the two great workers' Internationals was in largest measure due to the coherence, solidity, and empirical demonstrability of its responses to these questions. Nothing of the sort is yet true of current Marxism, and the first requirement of a new great movement for socialism is that such a body of thought be reconstituted. Of course, this is not to say that elements of the answer do not already exist, or that it need be grown from the egg, so to speak. The thought and experience of more than a century of Marxism is the groundwork upon which the new structure can and must be built. It is a work that cannot be done by any who do not treat the Marxist programs of yesterday with respect; but no more can it be done by any who treat them with piety.

To answer the first of the needs of modern Marxism, the analyst needs to know how to penetrate beneath the surface of capitalism, beneath its various effects and artifacts, and associate its crises and degradations with the social structure itself. To answer the second requirement listed above, a new conception of the crisis of capitalism is required, substantially different from the simplistic, schematic, and unscientific "Marxist economics" of the past, a conception which understands the crisis in its socio-economic totality rather than as a series of cataclysmic economic "events." The third requirement, since it deals primarily with the analysis of societies which did not exist when the world views of the two great Internationals were formed, represents a fresh demand upon Marxism of the greatest importance. And finally the fourth—the provision of a perspective for the struggle, a conception of how and by whom the developed capitalist societies will be revolutionized—is the ultimate object of the totality of the Marxist analysis, to which a few closing words may be addressed.

For a while it was popular to think that a perspective for socialist revolution in the capitalist countries was impossible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and unnecessary: impossible, because the working class had been bourgeoisified and, corrupted by bounty from the imperialist table, had become part of the privileged of the world in some absolute sense; unnecessary, because the downfall of imperialism would come about through the efforts of the Third World peoples, who would cut the ground from under it, surround it, and eventually strangle it. That there is a great deal of truth in this perspective is clear, since something of this sort is happening before our eyes every day. But it is perhaps useful only as an "ultimate" analysis. In practice, as we have begun to see during the last few years, this process sets in motion serious economic disorders: balance-of-payments crises, inflation, and long-term trends to constricting standards of living. Perhaps the most dramatic example of the manner in which the Third World peoples can upset the social stability of an imperialist country is the Vietnam War. The inexorable closing of the ring of anti-imperialism thus cannot be regarded as a *substitute* for the crisis of the imperialist countries, but rather its necessary precondition and precipitator.

The narrowing of the arena of imperialism intensifies its indigenous crises. As an important example, there is the effect upon the newly created underclass of advanced capitalism. This substratum of the proletariat, often divided from the rest of the population not only along occupational but also in part along racial and national lines, takes the form in the United States of a particularly oppressed layer of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and some other racial and national groups. In Europe it is seen in the enlargement of the labor force in the northern part of the continent to encompass the surplus labor of its southern part, of South Asia, North Africa, and the West Indies. And on both continents, it also takes the form of the recruitment of a great deal of new female labor—of all races and nationalities—into the bottom layers of the proletariat. It is at once clear that this new proletariat, so recruited and so divided from the rest of the population, will respond with special sympathy to the revolts of Third World peoples. It is also clear that insofar as the potentially most revolutionary sector of society is divided from the rest by racial and national barriers—and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often by sex as well—a complex of analysis is opened up in which traditional class struggle is complicated by racist and other antagonisms, and in which the capitalist Establishment, for its part, will utilize such divisions in order to reinforce the existing conservatism of other parts of the proletariat. This analysis remains, in largest part, still to be made.

Another of the crises of modern capitalism is to be found in the pervasive malaise of social life which testifies to the inability of capitalism—no matter how "efficient" or, by its own standards, "productive" it may be—to create a functioning society on the basis of modern industry. This sickness can be seen in everything from the gross functional failures of the cities to the more individual failures of individual satisfaction, in work and in personal life alike, among all layers of the population. Thus far, the popular analyses that have been provided in this area reflect middle-class preoccupations: these are divided between a revolt against "industrialism" itself on the one side and vain efforts to conceive of "controls" and "reforms" that will purge capitalism of its natural ills on the other. Both tendencies reflect an inability to transcend a bourgeois horizon. But this is happening at a time when great numbers of people are ready for a conception of capitalism that steps outside its bounds, and views it as a system in mortal crisis. Thus here as well, an immense field of fruitful work awaits Marxists of the next generation.

Finally we come to politics. In no country of advanced capitalism has any Marxist party yet solved the riddle of mass politics, which is to say *how to enter the political arena as a revolutionary force.* This has been as true for the politics of unionism as for the politics of parliamentarism (and the former is just as important as the latter). From the United States to Germany, and from Italy to Scandinavia, the best minds of three generations of revolutionaries have battered against this riddle with little success. Revolutionary parties which adapt themselves to the bargaining orientation of unions, or to the reform orientation of day-to-day electoral politics, have great difficulty in surviving as revolutionary parties. On the other hand, insofar as these are the arenas of daily struggle of masses

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the population, engaging such political and class-struggle interests, however weak, as they do display, no party of the people can stand aside from them. Social Democracy first, and the Popular Frontism of the Communist International later, did, it is true, find a solution of sorts by depositing their revolutionary principles outside the doors to the unions and parliaments. But in reality this is capitulation rather than solution, and provides for the dilemma not so much an answer as its prime historical illustration.

This last and greatest problem of Marxism in the developed capitalist countries embraces a host of subsidiary problems, which include the nature of a revolutionary party in such countries, its mass popular appeal, its prime constituencies, and its forms of organization and activity. It must be emphasized that of all the problems of Marxism, this is the most important and also the most difficult of solution. The many efforts that have ended in failure testify to the fact that the problem has been, in a certain sense, heretofore insoluble. That is to say, it has proved insoluble to those who have had to tackle it on the basis of unfavorable relationships of forces which have sometimes included in the adverse balance not only the bourgeoisie and various middle-class antagonists, but also large Social Democratic portions of the working class, and later the Soviet Union and official Communism as well. Since this problem will prove soluble only on the basis of a new relationship of forces, one which does not yet exist and of which we have seen in the sixties only slight anticipatory hints, its solution in theoretical form remains very difficult. It will be solved in the practice of revolution, rather than in a theoretical and academic way. But this does not mean that a great deal of work cannot be done—is not already being done—toward the understanding of the conditions for a solution, and toward the creation of a generation of revolutionaries prepared to solve it. In the first rank of such work is every study of the history of the socialist movement which is directed not to the proving of a preconceived or sectarian notion, but toward the understanding of what really happened to the immense revolutionary working-class movements of the past, and why.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARESH CHATTOPADHYAY

For the purposes of this article we follow the most outstanding representatives of Marxism in considering Marxist thought uniquely as a guide to (revolutionary) action. Applying the Marxist theory of knowledge to Marxism itself, we can say that advances in Marxist thought are possible only on the basis of practice. There is no such thing as "pure" Marxist thought capable of making progress "academically" isolated from Marxist, i.e., revolutionary proletarian, practice. No wonder that the most important advances in Marxist thought have always been made precisely by the greatest participants of revolutionary practice beginning with Marx and Engels. This also holds true for the period since the Second World War which is here under review. Indeed, the most important advances in Marxist thought during this period have been made by Mao Tse-tung (and the Chinese Communists under his leadership). Mao, like Lenin before him, advanced Marxist thought through restoring its revolutionary essence in a struggle against opportunists of all hues masquerading as "Marxists."

The main preoccupation of Mao and his comrades during the period under consideration has been the nature of the transitional society between capitalism and communism. Building on his earlier work on dialectics—"nothing in the world develops evenly"—as well as on the historical lessons, positive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and negative, drawn from the experience of socialist construction in China and elsewhere, Mao, unlike the successors of Lenin in the USSR, emphasizes the persistence of contradictions between the base and the superstructure and between the forces of production and the relations of production and, more particularly, the persistence of class struggles in the transitional society. Contrary to those (inside and outside China) who held that social harmony and equilibrium were the predominant factors making for the progress of socialism in the transitional society, Mao insisted on the primacy of struggles and disequilibrium as the moving forces. For them, to use the terms of the 1964 debate, it was a question of "one divides into two" and not of "two combine into one." In the transitional society, subject to such contradictions, whether the forces of capitalism or the forces of socialism will win is really not settled. There is always the possibility of a historical reversal to the old society (whatever the *legal form* in which the production relations manifest themselves). Moreover, once capitalism is restored in such a society there arises the possibility of the appearance there of what the Chinese Communists have correctly called, following Lenin, social imperialism. Restoration of capitalism can be prevented and the victory of socialism assured only on the basis of the correct handling of contradictions between the people and their enemies and among the people themselves, following the method of "struggle, criticism, transformation." This has been a running and developing theme with Mao and his comrades for the whole of the period under consideration, though it has some important "moments" like *On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation* (1955), *On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (1956), *On Ten Great Relationships* (1956), *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* (1957), *Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?* (1963), besides the series of open polemics against modern revisionism in the international working-class movement and the Central Committee's resolution (1966) on the Great Proletarian Revolution.

Some important conclusions—marking significant advances in Marxist thought—followed from this analysis of contradictions in a society constructing socialism. First, as regards the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

model of economic development toward socialism, Mao and the Chinese Communists under his leadership at first partially, and then almost totally, rejected the Soviet model, which in fact turned out to be a particular version of the capitalist model of development. From their conviction that the production relations had already been taken care of by the seizure of political power by the proletariat and the juridical transformation of the property relations, and that what remained for the strengthening of socialism was the advance of the productive forces (implying thereby a class-neutral view of science and technology), the successors of Lenin concluded that the quickest way to develop the productive forces (the "material base") was the accelerated pace of heavy industry at the cost of light industry, accompanied by the primacy of material incentives and the extreme inequality of rewards as between the workers and the technicians. This model of development resulted in disequilibrium between the town and the countryside as well as between the working class and the peasantry, and brought into sharp relief the incessant reproduction of the capitalist division of labor—all this happening within the general framework of what is virtually a sale of labor power against wages by the direct producers, in the absence of their domination over the conditions of production (except theoretically). Rejecting this essentially capitalist model, Mao asserted the model of co-ordinated development—"walking on two legs"—of agriculture and industry, heavy and light industry, coastal and interior industry, defense and economic development —all this conceived not as a narrow "economic" model but as being very much subordinate to a continuous struggle by the producers to dominate the conditions of production. It is precisely through the political and social mobilization of the masses, and through the process of uninterrupted revolutionizing of the social relations of production (along with the political and ideological superstructure), that the productive forces themselves can be developed. One important "economic" consequence of this approach is the non-necessity, for the development of the productive forces, of an "original accumulation of capital," contrary to both the "classical" capitalist and the Soviet models. In this sense the whole strategy of economic development, with the human producer and not technique as the moving force, put

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"politics in command," implying thereby the necessity of unceasing struggle against the survivals of the old society as well as against the emergence in the new society, through the process of production, of traditional social divisions and privileges even after the juridical transformation of property relations. "Never forget the class struggle."

Secondly, on the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Mao advanced Marxist thought by breaking with the Stalinist tradition, faithfully continued by Stalin's successors in the USSR, by restoring and asserting its true meaning, namely, that the dictatorship is oppressive only as regards the enemies of the people—a handful of persons—but is at the same time the broadest democracy guaranteeing maximum liberty, including the liberty to make mistakes, for the proletariat and its allies, i.e., the overwhelming majority of the society. Carefully distinguishing between the people and their enemies and between the two types of contradictions—those between the people and their enemies and those among the people themselves—Mao incessantly stressed, for the proletariat and its allies (that is, the people), the democratic way of education and persuasion as against authoritarianism or force as the means to resolve the contradictions. Mao called it "self-education in the ranks of the people, its fundamental method being criticism and self-criticism."

Thirdly, linked with the concept of the proletarian dictatorship, is the question of the position of the party in relation to the masses. For Mao the party is never a substitute for the masses, it can do nothing on their behalf. The liberation of the masses is the task of the masses themselves; and the party, submitting to a process of continuous criticism and even purges by the masses ("bombard the headquarters"), is only an *instrument* of the dictatorship of the proletariat and never the repository of all truth and all wisdom. The party's role is constantly to sum up the experiences and the correct ideas of the masses in order to return them to the masses in a more elaborated form ("from the masses to the masses"). The party, being inseparable from the masses, is more a leading nucleus than a "vanguard" standing *above* the masses.

We conclude that the most important advances in Marxist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought during the last 25 years have been in the area of the analysis of the transitional society between capitalism and communism.

On the other hand, the following seem to be the areas where reality is far ahead of scientific analysis and where progress in Marxist thought is most needed:

(1) Modern imperialism: the relation between industrial and military production, multinational corporations and their relation to the state power, the character of proletarian revolution.

(2) Imperialism in relation to the *formally* independent "ex-colonies," neo-colonialism.

(3) Social imperialism, its internal and external contradictions.

(4) Sub-imperialism (India, Iran, Israel, South Africa, Brazil, etc.).

(5) Struggle for socialism in countries starting practically without any industrial proletariat and without a Marxist party; the role of state capitalism in these countries.

We abstain from mentioning the unsatisfactory character of Marxist thought in areas of "secondary" importance like aesthetics, "pure" sciences and mathematics, etc.

OLIVER C. COX

I asked the editors of this symposium not to categorize me as a "Marxist-Leninist" because, although I am not an "anti-Marxist-Leninist," I see my orientation to the study of the emergent socialist world as distinct enough to avoid such an identification. The orthodox approach to assessments of the indices of "revolutionary" change in the capitalist system has been to conceive of change as developing essentially from an elemental struggle for economic and political power between capital and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor. This outlook has not been restricted to Marxist socialist thinkers.* It was —let us consider at random— constantly implied by businessmen, in arguments following the April 1962 steel-price reversal, that the President's "hostility toward business" clearly identified him as pro-labor.

And yet, to me, nothing seemed more mistaken. The Kennedy administration was fatefully concerned with inflation, recession, and economic growth; it was, therefore, driven rationally to seek restraints on the traditional freedom of both business and labor. Administrative planning inevitably involved this. Organized labor, as well as "big business," abhors such restraints.

It seems erroneous, furthermore, to think that working people, in every situation of the capitalist system, must needs be socialistically revolutionary. It would be more correct to recognize that the dominant proletarian tradition, especially in advanced capitalist societies, has been pro-labor but anti-socialist. The philosophy of the most strategically organized workers in the leading capitalist nations has clearly been that there is more to get through capitalism. Their perennially absorbing problem, which presumably may be periodically solved by monopolistic bargaining, has been how to get it. The dominant position of "labor" in the 1972 presidential election has given us some consistent lessons. Perhaps it is this general conception which led John Strachey, who had at first hand seen British labor shrink back from an open road to "socialism," to write:

> I think that the social form [of capital accumulation] is all-important for differentiating types of societies; but I also think that experience has shown that it is the amount rather than the form which determines the standard of life; a very different matter.
>
> I am impressed by the fact that societies, in a comparable

* Incidentally, this seems to have been the general orientation of the valuable symposium *Has Capitalism Changed?* Shigeto Tsuru, ed. (Tokyo, 1961). It is, moreover, what the *Communist Manifesto* is mainly about. As Marx suggests elsewhere: "The limits within which the preservation and augmentation of the value of capital, *which is based upon the expropriation and pauperization of the great mass of producers,* must take place, are always conflicting with the methods of production which capital must employ to attain its ends. These methods lead directly towards an unlimited expansion of production, towards production for its own sake, towards an unconditional development of the forces of society." *Capital,* vol. 3, pt. 1. (Emphasis added.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stage of development, have rather similar standards of life, whether they are socialist or capitalist. It does not seem to make all that difference to the national standard of life whether, say, 12 percent of the gross national product is put aside for further accumulation in the form of private profit or in the form of a social fund. This does not mean that there is no difference between socialism and capitalism; but it does mean that the socialist may have been rather naive in supposing that in the short run, huge immediate benefits could be secured by a change in the social system.*

And still more pertinently Strachey remarks: "If . . . it was possible to redistribute the national income in a capitalist society sufficiently equitably, I do not see any reason to suppose that it would exhibit much instability, either from economic or political causes."** It may be shown, moreover, as Strachey does for Britain and others for the United States, that the process of "redistribution" is already well under way in advanced capitalist nations.

Clearly, then, even sophisticated socialist thinkers, to say nothing about the practical leadership of business unionism, may not want an immediate, or even a foreseeable transformation of their capitalist countries—and for good reason. That reason was nowhere developed in the symposium *Has Capitalism Changed?,* to which I have just referred, but its distinguished editor, Shigeto Tsuru, agreed with Strachey in saying that "the problem which confronts socialist parties in countries like England and Japan is how to accomplish [the transition from capitalism to socialism] peacefully and gradually."*** It would probably not be far from

* In Shigeto Tsuru, ed., *Has Capitalism Changed?,* p. 76.

** *Ibid.,* p. 71. It is true that "socialism" emphasizes equality, but this alone is a utopian dream. The real challenge of socialism rests in its advertised capacity to develop infinitely, economically and socially. The attraction of socialism for underdeveloped peoples seems to be not particularly equality among kinsmen but its capacity to bring them into the stream of modern cultural development. For a recent emphasis upon equality see Michael P. Lerner, *The New Socialist Revolution* (New York, 1973).

*** *Ibid.,* pp. 192-193. Would a revolutionary socialist government in either present-day Japan or Britain, isolated from the rest of the capitalist world, be able to improve the standard of living and enhance the cultural welfare of the abnormally large populations of those islands? It seems to us that such a government would precipitate hardships which cannot be corrected internally. When socialism comes to Britain and Japan, it will probably be in association with larger communities such as continental Europe and Asia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the truth to say that the problem which confronts organized labor in the United States, as defined by its leadership, is how to resist the advent of socialism for all time. If this conclusion is accurate, the ineluctable historical forces involved in the transformation of capitalism will doubtless be as frustrating to American labor as they must necessarily be to capital.

It is not that working people, industrial workers, always harbor revolutionary sentiments and thus constitute the natural shock troops in every modern socialist revolutionary situation—they may be, as in Cuba, swept up by an accidental "revolution"—but rather that they are indispensable to socialist development. It is largely they, in any event, who must be inspired by the creative socialist leadership to put the specific revolutionary society on its feet—if, indeed, it can ever be made viable and self-supporting. Apparently, the critical human change in the transition of a capitalist society is that of entrepreneurship, involving a different purpose and way of organizing factors of production. Techniques and skills are not only hard to come by, but also scarcely change because of revolution. Conforming to their own inherent principles of efficiency, they are identified with development of the material instruments of production. Socialism will provide their peculiar social meaning.

It is important to observe that Strachey—perhaps incidentally—emphasized "different types of societies." Capitalism constitutes a peculiar type of society and its universalistic system. Before considering movements in capitalist societies, it may be well to state again our conception of the social organization subject to change. The following societal components seem essential: (a) a distinctive way of producing wealth, (b) an associated political system, and (c) a specialized, nationalistic religion. If these are present and properly related, it may be possible for a great capitalist community to rise up on a reasonably large patch of sand in some accessible part of an ocean, but not, incidentally, a great socialist society. A capitalist ethos—spirit, ideology—will determine the proper, moving adjustments of the social components.

Capitalism has its own peculiar history which cannot be reversed. It has developed as an increasingly inclusive, societally interdependent system. It is with the structure of this system

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that socialism must eventually be involved—not, misleadingly, with its "national" components. The functional heart of the system is foreign commerce; and nationalism is a consequence of competition in external markets. Industry, its mechanization and development, is mainly the result of *capitalist* foreign commercial expansion. Invention of the steam engine was merely the completion of one step in the continuous growth of capitalist science and technology. Its roots are to be found in the primary efforts of workers in the European capitalist cities. It was cotton textiles (let us recall) not woolen, which first brought the engine into service. And the shipping back into India of cotton as cloth destroyed the developed Indian hand-weaving industry.

I think the Marxian socialists' focus on the English industrial revolution leads them astray and eventually toward dead ends. Socialism has been developing as a result of continuous, inherent changes of the capitalist system. It is possible to demonstrate that socialism was in the womb of the capitalist system from its very beginning. Early capitalism, however, was no part of feudalism. We cannot reasonably say, therefore, that as "labor" attains maturity, it will "overthrow" capitalism just as capitalism overthrew feudalism. The struggle between capitalism and feudalism involved distinct types of society; the sporadic conflict attendant upon the coming of socialism involves a transition of the capitalist system. Capitalism eventually provides the infrastructure of socialism.

We shall assume that even the Soviet Union and China are still in motion toward socialism. The people of the world are now ready to deal with the world and its resources purposively. Capitalism made that development possible. The small nations of the world cannot become expanding capitalist countries, hence they can have no generic socialist existence. As a first meaningful step, therefore, the world in peaceful communication must become regionalized. It must decide upon functional ecological areas, large enough to make economic and cultural development profitable. Stated differently, the areas intended for socialist growth must be large enough to make the use of science and technology in production self-generative.

The ecology of China and Russia obviously allows for such a culmination. Possibly India, together with the islands of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waters, may constitute a sufficient base for socialist occupation and growth. Brazil and Zaire (the Congo) should probably be included in this category. The people of the United States and Canada could doubtless use their entire territory more productively as a single community. I do not intend to offer a blueprint. As capitalist communities, the individual nations of Africa, on the whole, are extremely stagnant. They are too limited in population and resources to try "socialism" of the Russian or Chinese variety. In order for socialism to liberate a people, they must be able to exploit capital in production creatively. It is only through such means that the idea of group perfectibility may be advanced. Paradoxically, however, the very development of science and technology in the advanced capitalist nations may be a force prohibitive of the rise and growth of the independent use of capital in underdeveloped countries.

The idea of unification for cooperative development is suggested by the recent "common market" movements in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa. It was in such a spirit that Modeiba Keita, President of Mali in 1961, declared: "We are convinced that the states of Africa will never be independent, in the full sense of the word, if they remain small states, more or less opposed to one another, each having its own policy, each taking no account of the policy of the other."* In such countries, as the cases of Guinea, Cuba, and Chile demonstrate, attempts to introduce socialism may become a negative force. Before unification for socialism, that nation may still find, in "neocolonialism," greater stimulus for its limited growth and development.

It is not that capitalist-socialist conflict has been resolved by such movement toward an ecology of socialism. The process is continuous. As the leading capitalist nation or nations continue to lose the power to deal effectively (economically and morally) with the rest of the people of the globe, the socialist alternative will doubtless become more obvious and thus more

* Colin Legum, *Pan-Africanism* (New York, 1962), p. 66. There have been many attempts to unify Africa in whole or in part. See for another review, Jay Walz, "An Emperor Tries to Unite Africa," *New York Times Magazine* (March 8, 1964), p. 18ff.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generally feasible. Unification is not necessary for capitalist production.

Socialism, however, has to realize that it must give up nationalism, the frightful defensiveness toward shares of the resources of the earth. In this respect, the current Chinese-Russian relationship must give us pause. The European Common Market is bogged down in it.

International capitalist attitudes also determine domestic individualism. Cooperativeness rather than competitiveness toward the common tasks of developing the resources and thus the peoples of the globe would redefine the meaning and purpose of the advanced cultures abroad. Perhaps socialism among the "underdeveloped peoples" must await the leadership of socialism in the advanced countries. It is, no doubt, from such a purpose that interracial respect, among other priceless human values, would eventually be derived.

ISABEL LARGUIA AND JOHN DUMOULIN

In responding to the editors' request for a short essay on advances in Marxist thought during the last 25 years and the areas most in need of further work, we have decided to concentrate entirely on the feminist movement and its relation to underlying changes in the economic role of women. This can be justified not so much by the achievements of these years, which are very modest indeed, but by the evident urgency of the need for Marxists to make up for lost time and to bring their work

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this field up to standards already attained in so many other areas.

The women's movement has grown rapidly in the United States and other developed capitalist countries, outside the sphere of interest of the working class and to a certain extent opposed to the Left. The feminism of the late sixties and early seventies has made demands quite different from those of the working class. This in turn corresponds to a tendency on the Left to condemn feminism as mere diversionism. But we must look at the situation of women as a whole to find the meaning of this outburst of consciousness.

An unprecedented change has taken place in women's participation in the labor force in recent decades. The number of women workers in the United States has increased enormously, while at the same time their earnings have undergone a relative decline. The percentage of women with jobs as a percent of total employment has increased progressively from 25 percent in 1940 to approximately 32 percent in 1955 to over 38 percent at the present time. In the same period and together with this increase, there has been a drastic reduction of the median income of working women in comparison with that of men. While an increase in part-time and temporary work had an effect at first, available figures show that, at least from 1955 on, wage discrimination against women has increased markedly: while the median income of full-time year-round women workers was 63.9 percent of men's in the former year, this figure has declined to 58.5 percent at the present time. In order to evaluate current feminism and to understand its significance and implications for the future, we must recognize in it the first reflection of these great changes in women's basic situation, of increasing proletarianization and discrimination within the labor force. Feminism is thus a manifestation of the changes in the "normal" situation of American women as they go out to work, particularly as wage workers. This fact has been disguised by the politico-ideological circumstances of its emergence.

The new feminist consciousness arose largely as a rejection of the male chauvinism manifested in left organizations. It came at the end of a decade of increased politicization of students

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sectors of the middle class, in which women participated in unprecedented numbers, particularly in the movement against the Vietnam War. It arose among young middle-class whites who had gone through the spiritual questioning of discrimination based on biological differences, in their association with and subsequent expulsion from the black movement. In the New Left organizations, where men had not questioned their *machismo*, the conditions were ripe for rebellion. The when and how of the rise of the feminist movement can be understood in these terms, but the why of it has to be searched out in the increased exploitation which motivated the outbreak and made it resonate throughout the society. The analysis of this exploitation will demonstrate that, despite what might be supposed from the discord between Marxists and feminists, *the exploitation of women in capitalist society is inseparable from that of the working class.*

The point of departure for this analysis must be the concept of the workers' labor power as the commodity they sell to the capitalist in exchange for a wage. The capitalists pay (in principle at any rate) the maintenance costs of the workers and their families, which constitutes the value of the labor power. Classically, this cost should be met in each family with one wage, the husband's, it being the norm that the wife be occupied with household duties, "invisible" labor destined to reproduce labor power in the home. But now, in a high percentage of households, the wife works too.

The most drastic change has been the incorporation of married women *with husband present* into the work force. Of these only 14.7 percent were working in 1940 while the figure is now above 42 percent (at a stage when the adult nucleus of the family has been reduced in practice to the couple, condensing in this sole relationship tasks and contradictions which at an earlier time were articulated through a larger and more complex family structure).

The great majority of married women who work outside the home have husbands whose income is at levels classified officially as of "pressing economic need," "low," or at any rate *below* the "modest but adequate" level for an urban family of four. *One wage is no longer sufficient to meet the cost of main-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taining the family, that is, the value of labor power (which, as we have seen, corresponds to the expenses *of the family as a whole* and not just of a single individual) is thus covered by two wages. As a result, not only does the mass of surplus value increase in consequence, but also the rate of surplus value.

Even when we take into account the many factors which tend to counteract this tendency, such as the increase in expenses consequent on the wife's going out to work, it remains evident that *the mass incorporation of married women into the labor force reflects a tendency to reduce the individual wage below the value of labor power (and even to reduce that value as it becomes normal for the wife to work) and correspondingly to increase the rate of profit.* Not only are two persons exploited in the family: the rate of their exploitation is higher.

The fact that women's median income has gone down in proportion to men's (now only 58.5 percent) shows that their entry into the labor market does not reflect an improvement in conditions for women but rather the increasing economic necessity of the family, that is, the depreciation of labor power in general. But it is also a source of additional surplus value in itself, a specific form of superexploitation.

Wage discrimination against women is inextricably linked to the superexploitation of the family as a whole. Although the two forms are by no means identical, each of them can be understood only by reference to the nature of wage exploitation, and of wages as the payment for labor power. The superexploitation of women has increased along with the rapid proletarianization of *married* women so that they now constitute the substantial majority of the female labor force. Since the "supplementary" character of wives' earnings has always been one of the main arguments for paying lower wages to women in general, it is easy to see how *press-ganging fifteen million wives into the proletariat over the past few decades has contributed to sharpening the wage discrimination specific to women,* which falls with really brutal force on women family heads.

When a woman does work of equal value to a man's, for a much lower wage, she is selling the same labor power for a lower price, and yielding a higher rate of surplus value. This kind of wage differential does not entail any material benefit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for men workers as a whole (although they do find advantage in job discrimination, through which they obtain the more skilled and, therefore, better paid jobs): there is only an appeal to the basest of human inclinations. On the contrary, the competition of workers who are obliged to accept a lower wage is a threat which tends to temper the force of wage demands. The superexploitation of women contributes in this respect to an increase in the exploitation of men as well.

Male chauvinism still prevails in the labor and left movements, as in society in general. This ideological deformation is the reason why the questions discussed here have received little attention and the situation of women as the most numerous superexploited sector of the working class has not been given priority. Feminism, on the other hand, passes over the situation of women proletarians and responds to discrimination in a utopian way. The two tendencies, between which there is virtually no inter-relationship, together have the effect of obscuring the increased extraction of unpaid labor from women workers especially, but also from men.

Discrimination against women has been practiced since the beginning of patriarchy, and it is inherent in class society; opposed social roles are used for the ideological coercion of women. All this has an important function in the economic system of modern capitalism. If, as Lenin said, politics is the concentrated expression of economics, scientific knowledge of, and tactical decisions for, the development of society as a whole can hardly be made without analyzing the role of half of humanity in class production relations.

The following additional problems are important for Marxists and all those concerned with the liberation of women:

(1) The economic function of the housewife in the reproduction of labor power, with its implications for the theory of exploitation and economic development.

(2) The division of labor between the sexes within the working class and in political organizations.

(3) The ideological coercion to which women are subjected through opposed sexual typologies and the corresponding ideological influence of the housewife, all of which can have serious effects, even on the vanguard of revolutionary change.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RALPH MILIBAND

There is a very striking contrast to be drawn between, on the one hand, the state of revolutionary politics in the last twenty-odd years, and the state of Marxist thought on the other. The picture presented by revolutionary politics in this period is by no means all negative; but it is nevertheless a rather somber picture, with only an occasional patch of light. In regard to Marxist thought, on the contrary, there are few areas where substantial advances have not been made, one way and another: in this instance, the general picture is remarkably positive.

Perhaps the best indication that this is so is the vast growth of interest which has occured in relation to the literature of Marxism, so much so that it is possible to speak of a veritable rediscovery of Marx and of formerly reviled, suspect, or ignored figures, such as Trotsky, Luxemburg, and Gramsci, not to mention lesser figures who sank into oblivion in the long era of the Stalinist freeze and who are now being returned to their rightful place in Marxist intellectual life. Similarly, there has in recent years been a vast proliferation of writing in the Marxist idiom, which has encompassed most areas of thought. It would obviously be foolish to claim or suggest that all such writing makes a contribution to the development of Marxist thought. But this is not quite the point. What is important is that the interest is there and that serious work is being done, not least in the demystification of socialist history in the twentieth century. This is what I mean by advance, for it brings Marxist thought into the mainstream of intellectual life, affects the political culture, and begins thereby to influence political life itself. This whole process, which is by no means simple and direct, is more advanced in some countries than in others: it is more advanced in France than in the United States and in Italy than in Great Britain. But "it moves" everywhere.

That it does move is not due to the reincarnation in Marxist garb of the Hegelian Idea, irresistibly wending its way in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world. It is, above all, the result of the "objective contradictions" of a very material world, which have drawn more and more people into at least a consideration of Marxist thought, the more so since these same "contradictions" have cast such a cruel light on so much orthodox social science—see, for instance, what has become of "the end of ideology" apologetics and the "affluent society" fantasies of the fifties and sixties, not to speak of all the other emollient mystifications of the postwar years. This is not to say that more and more people "embrace" Marxism like a newfound religion, or that it offers instant "solutions" to all the problems of a tortured world. It is rather that it is increasingly seen as having both a critical edge and a capacity for generating fruitful hypotheses about the world, in ways which other modes of thought lack. No more, but no less either.

The quotation marks around "objective contradictions" are intended to draw attention to what has perhaps been the greatest single advance in Marxist thought in this period, namely, the fact that Marxists are now much less prone than used to be the case to use such formulas as incantations in lieu of serious probing of stubbornly complex phenomena. This is not, of course, to deny the reality and the importance and even the primacy of these "contradictions," or at least the degree to which they impinge upon and help to shape all else. What is involved here is something else altogether, namely, the much greater awareness that now exists of the dangers of an economistic type of thinking to which Marxism has traditionally been very prone, and as a result of which a whole range of major social factors and problems are relegated to a supposedly secondary, residual, and derivative superstructural sphere.

It is true that, in reaction to economistic rigidities, the pendulum has in these years swung back and forth fairly wildly —back in the direction of a de-materialized humanism or an unrooted voluntarism, and forth in the direction of a would-be scientificity of structuralist inspiration, which is not much less barren than the various heresies and deviations by which it is obsessed. Still, all this, whatever shortcomings it produces, is part of a genuine debate within Marxism, and its continuation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and flowering is an essential condition for Marxism's existence as a living intellectual and political force.

As part of the emancipation of Marxist thought from economistic deformations, there has occurred a revival of interest and work in Marxist political theory, or in political theory with a strong Marxist orientation. In their brief to the contributors of this issue, the editors of MR ask: "What are the areas where further progress is now most needed?" This is certainly one such area. It is a sobering thought that for the best part of fifty years, political studies were abandoned to orthodoxy and apologetics. In no other area of the human sciences has the neglect been so marked—not in economics or in philosophy or least of all in historical work. It is only very recently that a real beginning has been made in the revival of Marxist work in this area; and it is hardly necessary to stress that this *is* only a beginning and that issues which are absolutely central to Marxist theory and practice still cry out for attention. Tackling these issues is a matter whose *political* importance, in quite direct and urgent ways, can hardly be overemphasized.

This means, among other things, that a vast amount of work needs to be done in the Marxist theory of the state, with all the ramifications this has, including the many questions raised by the concept of "the relative autonomy of the state" and the massive and growing unhingement between the economic developments of capitalism on the one hand and the "sovereign" nation-state on the other.

In speaking of the theory of the state, Marxists have generally taken capitalist society as their context. But there is an equally vast amount of work that needs to be done by Marxists on the state and the "political realm" in general in the context of "underindustrialized" societies. It is clearly not good enough to say that these countries, insofar as they are particularly prey to imperialism, are "run" from the metropolitan centers, particularly the United States. At the very least, matters must be declared to be rather more complex than that; and it is only recently, here too, that Marxist work has begun to emerge from crass oversimplifications or outright nonsense.

Nor is the gap between need and realization any the less in regard to the politics of the "socialist" countries, the countries of what used to be called "the Soviet bloc." It is scarcely credi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble, but it is nevertheless the case, that not since Trotsky attempted it some forty and more years ago has work in depth been done to effect a theorization of Stalinism, even though that experience has played so enormous and disastrous a role in the history of socialism in our times. Of course valuable work has been done by this or that individual researcher, but nothing which begins to match the scale of the effort needed. In the same vein, there is nothing as yet resembling a Marxist political sociology of the government and politics of the "socialist" world—what there is of a political sociology of that world remains dominated to the point of monopoly by bourgeois thought.

This is hardly an exhaustive catalogue of work to be done in Marxist political studies: the list could be extended indefinitely. And let it be stressed again that "thought" does not here stand for an academicism remote from political engagement: in the tradition of which Marx is the greatest example, it stands as part of that engagement, and as an essential part of it.

ANDREAS G. PAPANDREOU

I am sure that I am not alone in the feeling that it is difficult to meet the important questions raised by the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW in a balanced way. The segmentation of social science in various "disciplines" has effectively diminished our capabilities to conceptualize properly, beyond a more or less well-defined domain. For this reason I make no effort to appraise, say, the contributions of Marxists to philosophical thought. This segmentation, however, has done more damage than meets the eye. For even within the domain of one's so-called competence, it has tended to displace the focus of the problem, any problem, effectively disengaging it from its source, which inevitably must be sought in the unfolding unique historical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process. The consequence—especially among academics—is technocratic emptiness and ideology masquerading as science. None of us has been left untouched. Understandably, many Marxists sought refuge in the security provided by the writings of Marx and Lenin (or Marx and Trotsky), but did so by elevating the founders to the status of prophets or oracles. Interpretation of the written word took precedence over the genuinely Marxist study of the unfolding contemporary reality—and Marxism tended, in these instances, to become an ossified dogma, which it is not, instead of living on as a method both for historical analysis and for action, which it is.

These tendencies notwithstanding, a renaissance of Marxist thought is under way. Its roots are to be sought in the spread of socialism beyond the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, in the growing confrontation between contemporary imperialism and socialist liberation across the expanse of the peripheral world, and in the intensified conflict and disarray in the very heart of the capitalist metropolitan centers.

There is no doubt in my mind that Baran and Sweezy's *Monopoly Capital* constitutes a major contribution to Marxist thought. For it represents a highly successful effort to extend Marx's analysis of the "laws of motion" of capitalism to its new monopoly phase. The central motif is provided by the concepts of surplus generation and surplus absorption in the context of monopoly capitalism. The attempt by some Marxists to diminish the significance of this contribution by branding it as "Keynesian" lacks any justification.[1] Keynesianism deals with the surface phenomena of "mature" capitalism, with the monetary reflection of the structural stresses and strains —the contradictions which always reflect the growing basic conflict between the capacity to produce and the capacity to consume in the process of capitalist accumulation. In contrast, *Monopoly Capital* brings into relief the complex social transformations that are brought about by the special modes of overcoming this key contradiction which are characteristic of the monopoly phase of capitalism.

1. See Ernest Mandel, "La Théorie de la valeur-travail et le capitalisme monopolistique," in *Critique de l'économie politique* (No. 1, 1970).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One might have wished for a closer interweaving between the process of surplus generation and absorption, as described in *Monopoly Capital,* and the Marxist model of expanded reproduction. This not only because it would bring about a direct conciliation between Marx's *surplus value* and Baran and Sweezy's *surplus,* but also because it would reveal the implications for the *rate* of surplus value of a wasteful, militarized, and "consumerist" society. What I am really proposing here is a linking up of the work of Piero Sraffa[2] and his disciples on the one hand and *Monopoly Capital* on the other, in order to bring into relief the implications of the emergence of monopoly capitalism for the distribution of income between the bourgeoisie and the working class in the metropolitan centers, in the process of expanded reproduction. Such a development might go a long way toward explaining the stratification of the labor force in the metropolis as well as the momentum of capital export in this phase of capitalism.

Possibly of equal importance as a research topic is the study of the relevance of the "law of value" for metropolitan neocapitalism. I am not suggesting an extension of the well-known and rather sterile debate about the relevance of the "law of value" in socialist societies. Nor do I suggest a mere elaboration of the proposition that in monopoly capitalism market prices deviate from "production prices" (i.e., from their "transformed" values). I am concerned rather with the proposition that the accumulation process in this phase of capitalism is *not responsive* to market prices, but that to the contrary, market prices reflect the accumulation strategies of those in command. In sum, I wish to stress what I consider to be an important feature of neocapitalism, that, since the last world war, capitalism at the center and *within national boundaries* is increasingly planned. If this argument proves to be correct, then we could go on to argue that the basic contradiction of the capitalist mode of production becomes more intensely evident on a world scale, where increasingly multiple and competing centers of private power, the multinational corporations, are expanding their

2. *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control over markets and sources of raw materials and are internalizing segments of the international process of production.

Samir Amin's *L'Accumulation sur l'échelle mondiale*[3] is without doubt a classic and constitutes an excellent complement to *Monopoly Capital*. It re-examines a whole range of issues in their proper context—which is global, and succeeds in giving a clear and rigorous meaning to the concept of capitalist center (metropolis) and periphery (hinterland). This book is destined to have a major and lasting impact on Marxist economic thought. The analysis is carefully built on the distinction between central (metropolitan) capitalist formations and peripheral capitalist formations. In the former the capitalist mode of production is not only dominant, but also tends to become exclusive. In the latter it is dominant, but due to the "extroverted" character of the economies, it does not tend to become exclusive, with the consequence that what obtains is the "development of underdevelopment." It is not possible to do justice to this book in the space available. Suffice it to say that Amin, drawing on the best Marxist literature, weaves a powerful, consistent argument that accounts simultaneously for the various phases of capitalist development in the metropolitan centers and for the transformation of the periphery as it becomes integrated into the world capitalist system. Some will object to the fact that Amin's argument takes off from Arghiri Emmanuel's *Unequal Exchange*.[4] In my opinion, he succeeds by taking from Emmanuel the valid core of the thesis of unequal exchange and putting it to work in a masterful way. Amin's analysis, especially as it relates to the periphery's fate in the context of global capitalism, is very close to that contained in the many significant contributions of Latin American Marxist economists and sociologists.[5] Clearly these Latin American works stand on a par with the best. In this connection one should make special, separate mention of Baran's *The Politi-*

3. Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1970, second edition, 1971. To be published in English translation by Monthly Review Press, under the title *Accumulation on a World Scale*.

4. Monthly Review Press, 1972.

5. Andre Gunder Frank, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Theotonio dos Santos, and many other important authors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal Economy of Growth,[6] which anticipates much of this development. The literature on imperialism is also relevant here. Harry Magdoff's outstanding *The Age of Imperialism*[7] has exercised substantial influence on Marxist thinking on the topic.

Amin leaves the reader with what is indeed a fundamental research problem: What are the chances that the kind of development that has taken place in Canada, and to some extent in Mexico and Brazil, "development with dependency," may eventually become more characteristic, at least in the case of the relatively large peripheral nations, than the "development of underdevelopment"? While he tends to doubt it, and in this I join him, the problem is clearly most worthy of serious Marxist research.

Possibly the biggest research challenge for Marxists relates to the question of "transition" to socialism. This is so because Marxists have been hesitant, if not fearful, in extending the dialectic of class struggle to societies supposedly in transition from capitalism to socialism. While there has been some good discussion of the issue,[8] clearly the great theorist-practitioner of "transition" is Mao.

Possibly related to this issue is the long overdue study (since Lenin) of the state in its relations to class structure and class struggle. Two important works are worthy of mention: Ralph Miliband's *The State in Capitalist Society*[9] and Nicos Poulantzas' *Pouvoir Politique et Classes Sociales.*[10] I regret the fact that this kind of analysis has not been extended to transitional (socialist) formations. For without it we are likely to hold on to illusions or ideologies that interfere with the selection of the proper socialist liberation strategies.

---

6. Monthly Review Press, 1957.
7. Monthly Review Press, 1969.
8. See Charles Bettelheim, *La Transition vers l'économie socialiste* (Paris: Maspero, 1971) and Paul Sweezy and Charles Bettelheim, *On the Transition to Socialism* (Monthly Review Press, 1971).
9. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
10. Paris: Petite Collection Maspero, 1972.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLIVE Y. THOMAS

Any attempt to indicate and assess the most important developments in Marxist thought during the last 25 years and to project areas of future emphases, all in 1,500 words prepared at less than a month's notice, is surely a perilous venture, not to be lightly undertaken. However, the event—the twenty-fifth anniversary of MONTHLY REVIEW—deserves the tribute of one's best efforts at the near impossible.*

Given the world we live in, it was inevitable that Marxist thought, during the past 25 years, would have been preoccupied with the problems of antagonistic societies, and the transition from capitalism to socialism. Since in both these circumstances class is the fundamental issue of Marxist theory, much of the discussion has inevitably focussed on the theoretical and practical issues of class analysis. In addition, since the main objective of Marxism is not simply to understand the world, but to change it, theoretical advance also necessitated the study of problems of socialist construction. The far-reaching significance of this latter observation is fully realized when it is borne in mind that changing the world is not simply a matter of changing governments, or indeed of abolishing the political power of exploiting classes, but in fact nothing less than the construction of a new social order.

In light of these two primary features of Marxist analysis, there have been, to my mind, three noteworthy developments. The first of these centers on the work stressing the primacy of class conflict in the understanding of recent history, and upholding the strategic role of the working class in the abolition of capitalism and the construction of socialism. This might be dismissed as a "negative" achievement, because in the final analysis it only reasserts a well-established fundamental of Marxist thought. Nevertheless, it is remarkable because of the

* In this essay I have tried as much as possible to avoid detailing the specific authorship of ideas because of space limitations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profusion of theories under Marxist or "neo-Marxist" labels that ultimately asserted the contrary with which it has had to contend. It should also be noted that some of these theories have generated considerable popular support (particularly among the "radical" intelligentsia), whilst the period has been characterized by considerable pressures against "orthodox" Marxism.

Thus it was that we have had such theorists as Frantz Fanon whose work has idealized the Third World as opposed to the rest of the world. The Third World is seen as a global village in which the peasantry is the only revolutionary force. The working class has become either bourgeoisified (Europe/America), or "pampered by the colonial regime" (Third World). Such themes are also reflected in Arrighi and Saul's notion of the "labor aristocracy," Debray and Guevara's heroic *focos*, and even Mao's conception of guerrilla struggles. In the imperialist countries, these ideas have manifested themselves in a number of writers such as Garaudy and Marcuse. Thus to Marcuse the working classes of these countries have lost their revolutionary potential, and all "industrial" societies are repressed systems where class conflict as such is not the crucial historical phenomenon. Meanwhile, in Eastern Europe these ideas can be seen in Djilas's nominalist views of a "new class," and the generalized attacks on "Russian revisionism."

Marxist thought had to reassert class analysis in the face not only of these "new left" theories, but also of a whole host of reformulated bourgeois theories. These included Rostow's anti-communist manifesto, the theories of convergence and pluralism, the concept of the industrial society, the phenomenalist use of scientific methodology, positivism, structuralism, and functionalism.

The common features of these bourgeois theories have been their attempts to analyze the social organism without analyzing the social relationships which determine its structure, and their negation of a methodology based on movement from the abstract to the concrete, from the essence to the singular. Their own methodologies are based on the empirical description of facts and comparisons based on regularities in the observed facts, denying that the essence (i.e., the system of social relations) is the start-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing point of philosophical study. From a methodological standpoint both these right and left variations are ultimately brought into concordance by their positions on the issue of class analysis.

Three factors seem to account for these theoretical positions. First, there is a general attitude of mystification toward modern technology, and the attendant effects of technological growth, as seen in the rising numbers of technical/organizational employees, rapid industrial development, and urbanization. Second, there is a deep-seated distrust of the European/American working class. Under capitalism it is felt that the rise in material prosperity has been accompanied by a parallel rise in the acceptance of bourgeois ideas, whilst in the socialist countries the working class has been dismissed as lacking in revolutionary ardor, and preoccupied with its own material advance. In both cases, these harsh criticisms are supported by the undeniable evidences of the racist and nationalist attitudes of these working classes. Finally, there has been either (and sometimes both!) a similarly marked distrust of the incipient working classes in the Third World, or else an ignoring of these classes and the promulgation of the concept of a *proletarian nation*.

The fashionableness of some of these "neo-Marxist" theories has been spurred on by the euphoria generated by the early successes of some national liberation movements, and the energies displayed by the restless and alienated youth in the capitalist countries. There is no need to single out authors who have struggled against these tendencies even when it was unfashionable to do so, but in general those who have resisted these theoretical developments most strongly have been the so-called orthodox Marxist/Communist parties. This fact can be only too easily overlooked since, as Pradeep Bandyopadhyay (*Science and Society*, Summer 1972, pp. 130-131) has observed in connection with his study of French Marxism, the English language bibliography reads as if "the intellectual activities of the Communist Party and its members are either nonexistent or mainly crude propagandist efforts. . . . [A] corollary of this is the assumption that Marxist studies are challenging and fertile when they are the work of intellectual groups not associated with the Communist Party's positions." The result has been to distract us and bias us against "the many subtleties

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of *internal intellectual discussions* and the *work of the study centers and work groups* dominated by Party members." (Italics in the original.)

The second area of significance in recent Marxist thought is the effort to conceptualize an operational system of planning, capable of coping with problems of allocation and efficiency of resource use in a complex industrial context, and to reconcile these with socialist ideals, particularly the law of value. The original Marxist position (Lange in the 1930s), was in effect an attempt to simulate the norms of perfect competition on the basis of centrally directed prices. However, as Dobb has pointed out, this approach negates all of the efficiency advantages of central planning, particularly those which lie in its potential to reconcile *ex-ante* resource absorption and resource use.

The decisive advance on the work of Lange and Dobb was Kantorovich's invention of the system of linear programming, and his subsequent development, along with Novozhilov and Nemchinov, of programming techniques in the context of central planning. In addition, a number of other economists of varying Marxist hues have complemented this work, both by their assault on neoclassical capital theory and by their own efforts at a more rigorous formulation of the law of value—not open to Bortkiewicz's objections. This work reached its highest peak in Sraffa's restatement of the labor theory of value.

Genuine problems, however, remain to be overcome. In particular there is the need to avoid the mere substitution of mathematical rigor for social significance, while at the same time making the fullest use of modern mathematics and computing facilities. Evidence of this danger is seen in Sraffa's work—in his "accounting" concepts and his externally determined wage rate, both of which come close to ignoring the existence of a social class struggle over the distribution of the product.

There is also coming out of this literature the socialist debate on the law of value and the "role of commodity relations." These have frequently been posed as two issues, of both a practical and theoretical nature: (1) the role of the market in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planned economy; and (2) whether or not the law of value operates under socialism, i.e., whether individual prices should coincide with values. One cannot exaggerate the fundamental importance of these issues in decision-making and in resolving basic problems of socialist construction during the transitional phase, when a country has already achieved a high level of industrial maturity.

The third area of significant advance in Marxist thought has been in the study of imperialism. A number of scholars of varying Marxist positions have made invaluable contributions here. On the one hand, we have the contributions of scholars like Baran, Sweezy, Mandel, and Magdoff who have contributed to the development of the monopoly theory of monopoly capitalism and its international implications for capitalism and imperialism. On the other hand, persons like Rodney, Nkrumah, Frank, Dos Santos, Woddis, and Samir Amin have aided the theoretical development by focussing on the study of the peripheral countries and observing their underdevelopment as the necessary obverse of the development of capitalism. Baran in particular contributed much in his development of the concept of surplus, whilst Emmanuel's recent work on "unequal exchange" is easily the most important Marxist study in the theory of international trade. Rodney's work on Africa along with Frank's on Latin America remain the best historical elucidations of the development/underdevelopment processes.

Whilst many of these theorists have offered brilliant insights into imperialism, there has been a noticeable failure to carry the work through to a systematic Marxist theory of imperialism, capable of taking full account of contemporary social reality. Indeed, the methodological basis of some of the work, from a Marxist standpoint, is, to say the least, suspect. Thus Baran's concept of surplus can be, and often has been, misused and applied to *national* categories, in abstraction from the internal class relations. Similarly, some work on unequal-exchange and terms-of-trade analysis comes close to saying simply that these can be explained as problems which inhere in primary production *per se*, or reflect relations between nation states of differing economic strength.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An important theoretical development related to this work on imperialism has been the analysis of the "non-capitalist path." As developed by Marx and Lenin, socialism is of course a working-class ideology, because this class is the only class that can bring an end to capitalism and initiate the construction of a socialist society. However, the Third World is characterized by the underdevelopment of both the national bourgeoisie and the working class. Its characteristic features are the dominant roles assigned to the peasant, landlord, and petty bourgeois social strata. The question therefore arises as to how they are to progress to socialism. The theory of the "non-capitalist path to socialism" analyzes the potentialities of "national democracies" to achieve this objective. These democracies (e.g., Cuba, North Korea, North Vietnam, etc.) are considered as being in a state transitional to socialism, which does not presume the *necessity* of an indigenous capitalism. One definitive interpretation of the state of national democracy came out of the 1960 Meeting of Communist Workers Parties in Moscow. The theoretical work in response to this, both challenging and otherwise, constitutes an important stream in the evolution of Marxist thought.

What should be the future areas of analysis? Obviously, this will to a large extent depend on the circumstances confronting us. Yet certain indications seem clear. First, the major theoretical discussions indicated above are far from resolution. In particular we need more theoretical analysis of (1) planning under advanced socialism and emergent communism; (2) planning and resource management during the transition from underdevelopment to socialism (it is significant to note that except for this writer's forthcoming book, *Dependence and Transformation: The Economics of the Transition to Socialism* to be published by Monthly Review Press in July 1974, there is as yet no work in this field); (3) the study of imperialism under the impact of new forms of organized capitalism on class formation both in the center and the periphery; and (4) state "relations" between socialist countries, the capitalist world, and the national democracies.

A second major area of needed work is in the field of economic integration. To most scholars this seems to comprise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dull issues of trading treaties and negotiation of joint economic ventures; but there is little doubt that it is, and will continue to be, one of the dominant aspects in the shaping of the world for the rest of this century. Ranging from the European Common Market to Comecon, and including a large number of Third World economic cooperation schemes, these agreements will lead to substantial changes in the organizational structure and the material base of world production. After nearly 20 years during which their influence has steadily grown, it seems that Marxists generally are still not alerted to the crucial importance of these developments.

The final area I would mention here is the need to extend Marxist thought to cope more adequately with two dominant social phenomena, race and nationalism. Despite many weaknesses and the difficulties these have created, "new left" theories in many respects represent a genuine (although often not more than *subjective*) search for the means to incorporate these phenomena into a methodological system based on class analysis. The challenges thus presented still remain unresolved, and the highest level of philosophical and theoretical work is needed to deal satisfactorily with these issues in the contemporary world.

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

Special sub rates to students: $7 (foreign $8; £3·35)

☐ 1 year $9 (foreign $10; £4·20)
☐ 2 years $16 (foreign $18; £7·50)

Libraries and institutions $12 (foreign $13; £5·45)

Monthly Review Press
62 West 14th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

Monthly Review Press
21, Theobalds Road
London WCIX 8SL, England

I enclose $..... I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for ☐ two years ☐ one year

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(Canadian subscribers must pay foreign rate)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Economics of Colonialism

Britain and Kenya, 1870-1930

Richard D. Wolff

Richard Wolff seeks to show that British policy in Kenya was a rational response to Britain's economic problems and opportunities and that Britain derived significant advantage from its imperial presence there. He points out the relevance of themes in Marxist literature in offering new insights into the effect of British colonial policy both on Kenya and on Britain itself. $9.75

Recently published

The French Communist Party versus the Students

Revolutionary Politics in May-June 1968

Richard Johnson

"Destined to remain as an important contribution leading toward a greater understanding of the dynamics of political life in contemporary France."—*Perspective* Cloth $10.00 Paper $2.95

Yale University Press New Haven and London

SUBSCRIBERS: TO CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS

Please write us BEFORE you move, 60 days in advance if you can.

Mail to Subscription Dept., Monthly Review, 62 W. 14 St. New York City 10011

1. In this space, attach an OLD address label (or, if you don't have a label, give us your old address).

Name .....

OLD address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

2. And in this space, please print carefully your NEW address.

Name .....

NEW address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New from Monthly Review Press

REVOLUTION AND EVOLUTION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

by James and Grace Lee Boggs

The first part of this book provides a concise and instructive review of the revolutions of the twentieth century—the Russian, Chinese, Guinea-Bissau, and Vietnamese. The Boggs' seek to extract the principal lessons from each of these struggles and the special course taken by each, while, at the same time, they furnish a picture of the principal aspects of the currents of Marxism active in those revolutions.

A second section is devoted to the United States: it begins with a survey of the class forces in American history from the settlement of the original colonies to the present, with special attention to the enslaved black population; thereafter, they present their ideas on the objects and means of an American Revolution.

$10.00/£4·25/ CL3225 (cloth)

Now in paperback

CLASS CONFLICT IN EGYPT: 1945-1970

by Mahmoud Hussein

"Israel's politicians and strategists would do well to spend some of their precious spare time studying this book by an Egyptian communist and ardent nationalist . . . They might not only learn a lot about their Arab adversaries, but would also begin to understand why our propaganda has been so patently ineffective. . . . Brilliant dialectic and pungent rhetoric . . . An instinctive reaction of a Jewish reader in this country may be to dismiss it all as arrant nonsense; but this will not do. The picture painted by the author contains many elements that are evidently true. Moreover, in many points his analysis is patently superior to that prevailing in Israeli quarters. . . . Hussein's description of Nasser's resignation and reinstatement on June 9, 1967, is a masterpiece of historical analysis from the point of view of an Arab nationalist, and should be read and re-read by all those still hoping for an agreement with one of the Arab leaders but who have not yet made the effort to understand the social forces supporting the Arab rulers."—**Jerusalem Post.**

$4.50/£1·90/PB3349 (paper)

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS

62 West 14th St., New York, N.Y. 10011 21 Theobalds Rd., London WCIX 8SL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from inside front cover*)

One of our favorite letters recently received reads as follows: "This is a tight year and it was difficult to come up with the $25 for the MR Associates. On the other hand, having just written a pile of huge first-of-the-month checks for such items as rent, parasite-auto insurance, private-profit utility bills, etc., it is a real pleasure to send off an un-alienated check dedicated to the proposition that these other bills may someday be eliminated! Keep up the excellent work!" We hope all of you will derive equal pleasure from sending off those unalienated checks. It is never too late.

A communication from the Association of Malaysian Students in North America reminds us that 1974 marks the centennial of the Pangkor Engagement and the beginning of Britain's formal colonization of Malaysia. In the years since the Second World War the country has of course been decolonized. Unfortunately, however, this has resulted not in liberation but in neocolonization. "Political repression," the Malaysian students tell us, "has been and still is the basic tool in the exploitation of the peasants and workers of Malaysia," and they follow this statement with a recital, all too typical of the Third World today, of a long list of individual and mass arrests, imprisonments, torture, and all the other practices of imperialist exploitation. At about the same time that this message arrived, *Business Week* ran an article in its international business section entitled "Malaysia: A Pell-Mell Rush by Foreign Business," which begins: "It sounds like a capitalist's dream: a country with ample oil, cheap labor and land, a booming economy, and a stable government." As always, the capitalist's dream is the people's nightmare. The Students Association has set up a Committee for Human Rights and Justice for Political Prisoners of Malaysia and is soliciting support, financial and other, from North American anti-imperialists. Checks should be made payable and sent to CHRAJ-PEMAU (02-201293), c/o Second National Bank of New Haven, Whitney Avenue Office, New Haven, Conn. 06511.

We record with sorrow the death on April 22 of our old friend Fred Blossom, at his home in Pleasant Hill, Tennessee, at the age of 96. For several years Fred published Scott Nearing's quarterly "World Events," and when he was no longer able to carry the responsibility he arranged with us to add "World Events" as a monthly feature in MR. That was in 1953. In subsequent years Scott contributed 200 "columns" to MR, retiring in June 1972, at the age of 88. We shall miss Fred's cheerful and encouraging letters and postcards. He was a dedicated activist who supported practically all the radical causes of the twentieth century.

More than 200 small book publishers (including MR Press) and movement groups, fighting a new form of book censorship—control of distribution channels—have organized the New York Book Fair, "Alternatives in Print," to be held July 7, 8, and 9 in the New York Cultural Center, 2 Columbus Circle, Manhattan. Readers in the New York area are cordially invited to attend.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Monthly Review Press Paperbacks

WORKBOOK OF AN UNSUCCESSFUL ARCHITECT

by Harris Stone

". . . delightful to read and refreshing and beautiful to see. . . . A devastating critique of the profession of architecture as practiced in our time, it radiates good feeling and a lively spirit. . . . The story, personal and historical, comes across with the impact and wholeness of vision of an epic poem."—*The New Haven Register.* "His drawings are a joy. It is clear that Mr. Stone is unsuccessful not in his terms but in ours because he has refused to be a corporate spear-carrier."—*The Canadian Architect.*

Handwritten, with illustrations $3.45/£1·50/PB3322

SPIKS, short stories by Pedro Juan Soto

Introduction by Victoria Ortiz

"This is a landmark book, the first published work of one of the best modern Puerto Rican writers of serious fiction . . . His subject is the U.S.—the scene in New York and Puerto Rico, the interplay of the two cultures, the exploitation of the island, of the island in the city, of the islands of the Puerto Rican heart. . . . It is a tiny book of short works whose concision has the excitement of poetry because of the enormities suggested in so few words. . . . This is a work of protest as well as compassion . . ."—*The New Republic.*

$2.25/£1/PB3314

THE CHICANOS: The Life and Struggles of the Mexican Minority in the United States

by Gilberto López y Rivas

". . . a careful analysis of the history and current reality of the Chicanos in American society. From the 19th-century annexation of what was previously Mexican territory in the Southwest, down through the use of low-cost Mexican labor . . . the story is not one North Americans can be proud of. López documents his account with statistics then objectively describes the recent Chicano movement of resistance and revolt. . . . [A] careful history . . . —*Publishers' Weekly.* With readings. $3.25/£1·40/PB3292

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS

62 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011
21 Theobalds Road, London WCIX 8SL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED